Vol. IX., No. 11. FEBRUARY, 1920.

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

A Magazine to maintain the cause of
TRUTH, FREEDOM, and COMPREHENSIVENESS
in the Church of England.

EDITOR: REV. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE
Signs of the Times :—	
Christian Unity and the Lambeth Conference	501
Modern Churchmen in Council	502
An Infringement of Lay Rights	504
A Modernist Vindication	505
Christianity and Education .. .. .. Cyril Norwood, D.Litt.	506
An Eighteenth Century Moralist .. .. .. Alfred Fawkes, M.A.	524
Some Impressions of the Church in India .. J. Worsley Boden, M.A.	533
Reviews:—	
A Corner-stone of Theological Reconstruction	541
Religion Without God	548
Correspondence :—	
The Oxford Honour School of Theology ..	551

OXFORD: B. H. BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET.
London Agents: Simpkin, Marshall & Co.

Price 1/- net. Annual Subscription, 7/6.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

All literary contributions and books for review should be addressed to:—The Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D., Ripon Hall, Oxford.

All advertisements and orders should be addressed to:—Mr. B. H. BLACKWELL, Office of *The Modern Churchman*, 49 Broad Street, Oxford.

THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION

Inaugurated at the Church House, Westminster, October 31st, 1898.

President: Professor PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., LL.D., F.S.A., F.B.A., Oxford.

Vice-Presidents:

PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
F. C. CHANNING, Esq.
The Ven. Archdeacon CHARLES, F B.A.
G. COURTAULD, Esq.
The Rev. Canon CREMER.
The DEAN OF CARLISLE, F.B.A.
The Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY.
The Rev. Professor HENSLOW.
Sir LAURENCE JONES, Bt.
The Rev. Prof. KIRSOPP LAKE.
The Rev. W. MANNING, M.A.
The Rev. Dr. MORRISON, LL.D.
The Rev. Canon PAPILLON, M.A.
The DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.
The Rev. Canon PLUMPTRE.
LORD RUSSELL OF LIVERPOOL.
J. ST LOE STRACHEY, Esq.
The Rev. Dr. SYMONDS.

Members of the Council:

Chairman: Canon GLAZEBROOK, D.D.

Mr. F. H. ANSON, Prof. Sir W. ASHLEY, Ph.D., Preb. A. CALDECOTT, D.Litt., Canon CREMER, M.A., Rev. W. MANNING, M.A., Hon. Mrs. MATHESON, Rev. G. RENDALL, D.Litt., Mr. NOWELL SMITH, M.A., Rev. A A. SYMONDS, D.D., D.Litt., Hon. G. COLERIDGE, Rev. A. FAWKES, M.A., Rev. JOHN GAMBLE, B D., Rev. W. LUMMIS, B.D., REV. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D., C. NORWOOD, D.Litt, Canon PAPILLON, M.A., Mrs. REITH, Mr. H. F. WALKER, Miss ALLEN, Right Rev. Bishop BAYNES, Mr. W. B. GORDON, M.A., Rev. H. HANDLEY, M.A., The Very Rev. W. R. INGE, C.V.O., D.D., Professor F. B. JEVONS, D.Litt., Rev. C. H. S. MATTHEWS, M.A., Sir HARRY REICHEL, LL.D., Rev. C. F. RUSSELL, M.A., The DEAN OF CARLISLE, Canon TOLLINTON, D.D., Rev. H. A. WILSON, M.A., Rev. C. SHARP, M.A., Rev. Dr. MORRISON, Rev. C. EMMET, B.D., Miss A. GARDNER.

Hon. Secretary and Acting Treasurer—PHILIP BAGENAL, O.B.E., 32 George Street, Hanover Square, W.1.

Hon. Auditor.—Mr. ROBERT WARNER, F.C.A., 221 Moorgate Station Chambers, E.C.2.

Hon. Organizing Secretary.—Miss D. NUSSEY, Westfield, Ilkley.

Bankers.—LONDON CITY AND MIDLAND BANK, 129 New Bond Street, W.1.

AIMS OF THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

1.—To affirm the continuous and progressive character of the revelation given by the Holy Spirit in the spheres of knowledge and of conduct.

2.—To maintain the right and duty of the Church of England to restate her doctrines from time to time in accordance with this revelation.

3.—To uphold the historic comprehensiveness of the Church of England.

4.—To defend the freedom of responsible students, clerical as well as lay, in their work of criticism and research.

5.—To promote the adaptation of the Church services to the needs and knowledge of the time.

6.—To assert the claim of the laity to a larger share in the government and responsible work of the Church.

7.—To foster co-operation and fellowship between the Church of England and other Christian Churches.

8.—To study the application of Christian principles and ideals to the whole of our social life.

Annual Subscription.—Members at least 7/6; Associates, 1/-; Life Membership, £10. Cheques should be made payable to the Hon. Secretary of the Churchmen's Union.

All communications as to membership, subscriptions, changes of address, and business matters should be sent to the Hon. Secretary, Churchmen's Union, 32 George Street, Hanover Square, W.1.

The Modern Churchman is sent **free** to all full members of the Churchmen's Union.

FOREWORD.

Most readers of the Bible, Ruskin somewhere remarks, are apt to treat it very much as, in mediæval times, a hedgehog was supposed to deal with a bunch of grapes. Rolling themselves over it, they retire to enjoy such favourite texts as adhere to their theological stickles. But to take in the messages of the sacred writings as wholes, other and more economical means must be adopted, and the clusters fully and severally pressed. And so, when lecturing on the great Hebrew Prophets I have often found that a more homely and direct rendering of their sublime exhortations enabled my audiences (generally consisting of people of average attainments) to grasp more quickly their meaning. Perhaps my method may be the better appreciated by the following comparison, of a simple and modern phraseology with that which is more classical and archaic, which I read in Tucker's *Life in Ancient Athens*, p. 206.

Pasicles the son of Xanthippus, carefully cast his himation about him and strode through the pastas and aule towards the door, followed by his attendant Sosias. "By Poseidon," quoth Pasicles, "it behoveth us to hasten; for it is the time of full market, and haply Lysimachus will have completed his business at the table of Pasias before we arrive. Hearken, Sosias; take this mina of silver, run with all speed, and deliver it to Lysimachus."

Pasicles carefully adjusted his mantle, and strode through the alcove and the courtyard towards the door. Sosias followed. "Dear me," said Pasicles, "we must make haste: it must be ten o'clock, and I am afraid Lysimachus will have done with his business at Pasias's bank before we can get there. Here, Sosias; take four pounds, run as hard as you can, and give it to Lysimachus."

In addition to my more or, generally, less metrical paraphrase, I have occasionally transposed texts, and omitted, or otherwise drawn attention to, interpolations, and have substituted such newer renderings or readings as recent scholarship * and research suggest. I have also used quotation-marks, and capitals in personal pronouns without however any other implication than that of rendering first-aid.

Where, in any line, the thought has been substituted for that expressed in the Bible, the change is due to the adoption of some scholar's emendation.

I am not so foolish as to suppose I can paint the lily or gild pure gold, but experience convinces me that the original meaning and teaching of these writings are largely hidden from the average possessor of the Bible who, in this much-occupied day, wants some more simple, direct help than even excellent commentaries afford. It is such I have almost solely in view. While those who, having quaffed my homely goblet, find a brackish taste, can always return to the "well of English undefiled" with its stately and dignified expression, its familiar and musical cadence, and its happy and pleasing rhythm, permeated, it may be, with a more comprehensive meaning gained from such a presentation as this.

* Among the many scholars to whom this, admittedly imperfect and inadequate edition is indebted (the acknowledgment of which is here gratefully made) the following may be mentioned: Driver, Cheyne, Lofthouse, G. Adam Smith, Robertson Smith, Ryle, Budde, Kirkpatrick, Duhm, Gray, Box, Wellhausen, Cornill, Fenton, Wade. Marti, Ewald. Skinner, Whitehouse, Cooke, Kennedy, Ottley, Moulton, Selbie, Moss, Delitzsch, Dillmann, Wright, Kuenen, Klostermann, Hitzig, and, of course, my own (with the late F. H. Woods), "Hebrew Prophets for English Readers," published in four volumes, by the Oxford University Press, which I may perhaps be pardoned for commending to the ordinary reader who desires to become better acquainted with these noble, inspired and inspiring writings. The basis of the whole is the Revised Version, American as well as British. This, for the Old Testament, is greatly to be preferred to the Authorized Version, and its marginal readings should be frequently substituted.

Old World Messages for To-day.

PART I. Price 1/-; post free 1/1.

Catastrophic Ruin and Indomitable Hope.

A treatment of three books, with other striking passages from the Bible, approximating to the original meaning.
(Revised Edition).

CONTENTS.

I. Ezekiel's Inferno.
II. Isaiah's Reign of Righteousness and Peace (cc. ix; xi; xxxii).
III. Zephaniah's Dies Iræ, Dies Illa.
IV. Nahum's exultant At last!
V. Habakkuk's Perplexity and Hopeful Prayer.
VI. A Parable of Agricultural Methods.
VII. An Ode on the Inscrutability of the Divine Wisdom.

PART II. Price 6d.; post free 6½d.

The Day, The Wild Grapes, and The League of Nations.

A treatment of discourses delivered 2660 years ago, approximating to the original meaning, and shewing their remarkable applicability to modern conditions.

CONTENTS.

I. The Day (Isaiah ii.-iv.)
II. The Wild Grapes (Isaiah v., ix.-x., 4).
III. The Messianic League of Nations (Isaiah xix., 23-25.)

Arranged & annotated by FRANCIS E. POWELL, M.A.
Rector of Ladbroke.
Co-Editor of *The Hebrew Prophets for English Readers;* Editor of *The Unified Gospel;* Author of *'Neath the Syrian Blue; With Eastern Merchandise, &c.*

Published for the Author by
THOMAS MURBY & CO., FLEET LANE, LONDON, E.C. 4.

(2) We are of opinion that members of all our Churches should be free to share in one another's communions, when they wish to do so, under special circumstances such as the following :—

(*a*) When there is no communion of their own Church available.

(*b*) When Christians of different Churches are meeting together for fellowship and conference, and on special occasions of joint action and witness.

(3) The Churches should be asked to authorise such inter-communion.

(4) In view of such acts of inter-communion opportunities should be given for instruction in each other's system and worship, with a view to better mutual understanding, and to the appropriation of the distinctive spiritual gifts which each body has to offer.

(5) The Archbishops and Bishops of the Anglican Communion should be asked to make the question of unity the central issue at the coming Lambeth Conference.

(6) Representatives of the Church of England and of the Free Churches should be invited to come together at an early date for conference and prayer on this question, *making such conference the first claim on their time and attention* until definite conclusions have been arrived at.

(7) In preparation for the re-union of the Churches a widespread development of local inter-denominational activity and fellowship should be encouraged, and we would urge the importance of fostering a genuinely Catholic temper of mind among members of our congregations, so that they may feel concern for the whole Church as God's instrument for bringing in the Kingdom.

In putting forward these recommendations we fully realise that behind and beyond them lie the equally urgent questions raised by the divergence between Christian faith and practice; but it is precisely because of these that we feel the pressing need of re-union. The present situation demands the corporate witness of one Church. The furthering of Foreign Missionary enterprise, the promotion of the League of Nations, the re-ordering of society—in a word the establishing of the Kingdom of God, are tasks with which we cannot cope as individuals or as separate Churches. We cannot commend fellowship to the world while as Christians we are divided. If the Church stands for reality at all, it stands for the fellowship of men with God through Christ, and through Him with one another.

This re-union of the Body of Christ will not be easy of attainment. It demands of us prayer inspired by the faith that can remove mountains of difficulty, hope that refuses to be put to shame, and love which will overcome all that naturally divides men, and will bind us together in the service of God and man.

These findings were signed by a number of well-known Anglicans and Nonconformists, among whom were Bishop Hamilton Baines, the Bishop of Warrington, Dr. Vernon Bartlet, Mrs. Creighton, Dr. Orchard, Dean Rashdall, and Mr. Tatlow.

Modern Churchmen in Council

The Modern Churchmen's Conference will meet this year at Oxford. The Conference Committee has been fortunate enough to secure permission from the authorities of Somerville

College to hold the Conference there in August. The Conference will begin on Monday, August 23rd, and will close on Monday, August 30th. This date should prove to be convenient for the teaching profession, and it is hoped it will not be inconvenient for the clergy.

'Modern Knowledge and Traditional Christianity' is the subject which has been chosen for the Conference to consider. A series of papers and discussions will deal with the significance for Christianity of modern scientific discoveries, modern methods of historical research, modern conceptions of morality, modern political and social ideals. For many whose time for reading is limited, the papers, discussions and personal intercourse provided by the Conference can hardly fail to be luminous and stimulating. The perplexed enquirer may not get a final answer, but he will recognise in the Conference an intelligent determination to deal with difficulties; a resolute conviction that an intelligent solution is possible; and a consoling indication that the facile conclusions of the Agnostic and Materialist contain a smaller moral and social value, and are intellectually much less secure than the hardly-won solutions of the reverent and truth-loving modern Christian.

The modern Christian teacher is under no delusion. He is well aware that his advances beyond the standpoint of a lingering traditionalism cannot pretend to claim finality. But he must needs point to the continued growth of human knowledge, and insist on the duty of each generation, if true progress is to be secured, to master the religious and moral lessons of its own age and to leave to the next a legacy of accomplishment and understanding. The new learning is not the enemy of Christ's Religion; but it has widely disturbed the dogmas of traditional Christianity. Are we then, on this second count, to abandon our religion, and with it those moral ideals which, though we fall short of them in practice, cannot fail finally to lend restraint and inspiration to our conduct? Or shall we not rather strive, while we discard the necessarily erroneous views, the imperfect forms of expression, which still pass current for Christianity among the uneducated, to carry with faith and undeflected zeal into the life of the Nation those principles of Christian Faith and Duty, upon which its welfare and best hopes depend?

That is the issue which confronts the Christian to-day. We cannot stand where our forefathers stood, nor look out upon the Universe through their eyes. The task before us is exacting. Some would perhaps desert us for the easier ways of the Ultramontane or the Secularist. It is a simpler course to accept authority than to bear responsibility; it is easier to abandon religion than to understand or to reconstruct it. But the course of the considering Christian is clear. He must 'defend the Faith'; and to 'defend the Faith' in these days means to attain some higher synthesis of Ancient Faith and Modern Knowledge, lest we lose the real Christian thing and all it means for progressive civilization.[1]

An Infringement of Lay Rights

The following protest was made by Canon W. E. Boulter at the recent election of the Very Rev. W. S. Swayne to the See of Lincoln:

> 'I do utterly repudiate and abhor the doctrine that Chapters in election of Bishops are subject to the dictation of Princes; I protest that the enactments and threatenings of the civil law in this matter are spiritually void and of no force whatever; and I hope shortly to see the end of this most ancient and intolerable tyranny. Meanwhile, I find not to the contrary but that the person now nominated to us by His Majesty may rightly and freely be elected as our Bishop: and so I give my sentence.'[2]

This takes us back some 800 years in the history of the English Church, when Henry I, as a result of the Investiture controversy, first granted a *congé d'élire* to Cathedral Chapters instead of investing the English Bishops with the crozier as his predecessors had done. In Georgian times the right to issue the *congé d'élire* virtually passed into the hands of the Prime Minister as the representative of the Nation. When we remember that for centuries in the Primitive Church it was the laity, and not the clergy, who elected the Bishop, it is hard to imagine a better practical arrangement for securing that the will of the laity should be exercised in this matter than by vesting the right of episcopal appointment in the hands of the Prime

[1] Applications for Conference tickets should be made at once to Miss Nussey, Westfield, Ilkley.

[2] *Lincoln Diocesan Magazine,* January, 1920, pp. 12, 13.

Minister. On this arrangement the historian J. R. Green makes the following observation :—

> 'Practically therefore an English prelate, alone among all the prelates of the world, is now raised to his episcopal throne by the same popular election which raised Ambrose to his episcopal chair in Milan.'[1]

It is possible that ecclesiastical agitators may wrest this right from the Nation, and vest it in an elective body controlled by clericalists; but we may be sure that such action will deprive the Church of an episcopate so many-sided as the present, and will inevitably bring about the separation of Church and State. There are some among us who have practical experience of episcopal elections in our Colonial Churches, and feel as little desire to imitate the fashion of those Churches as to adopt the Papal method of episcopal appointment. Our clerical theorists, however, would rather wreck the National Church than permit any but themselves to rule it. We should like to point out that Canon Boulter, as a clergyman, had no right to protest in this matter. If a protest were to be made at all, it ought to have come from the laity of the Diocese of Lincoln. We wonder whether one *per cent.* of the laity had any desire to endorse this piece of clerical impertinence.

> 'Ye take too much upon you, ye sons of Levi.'

A Modernist Vindication

Canon Glazebrook's able reply to the Bishop of Ely's volume criticizing *The Faith of a Modern Churchman* has just been published. It is entitled *The Letter and the Spirit*,[2] and is no mere controversial diatribe. It contains much knowledge lucidly arranged, for like the judicious Hooker, Canon Glazebrook is less anxious to prove the Bishop of Ely wrong than to show why he is wrong. Those who read this volume, and we hope they will be many, will, we have little doubt, come to the conclusion that the Bishop of Ely, with his many labours and inadequate leisure, would have done better had he not undertaken to rebuke publicly one of his senior presbyters for expounding in a reverent and readable fashion the faith of a Modern Churchman.

[1] *Short History of the English People*, Vol. II, p. 667.

[2] Published by John Murray, price 5/- net.

CHRISTIANITY AND EDUCATION

By Cyril Norwood, D.Lit., Master of Marlborough.

THIS is a great subject upon which I have to attempt to speak, nor is it one wherein I see my way as clearly as I would wish. I should not have ventured to make any public statement about it if I had not been asked, but having been asked, I have taken that as a justification for speaking, and speaking out. For this is a problem of the most vital importance for our whole national future, and the present is a critical moment. It is not an hour for prophesying smooth things, and we must each bear our witness even at the cost of offence with absolute sincerity. No doubt my subject is only a part of the whole problem which you are considering in Oxford this week, which I take to be no other than how to bring the nation back to Christ. But I am not sure that it is not the most important part. I am not sure that we should not find that the strongest and most universal instrument which we have for shaping the nation of to-morrow lies to our hand in the schools if we can but use them in the right way, stronger than the organized Churches because the schools can be escaped by no one.

We must naturally begin by surveying the ground, and we must recognize at the outset that there are two systems of education in this country. The one is based upon the elementary school, and rises to different forms of secondary school, whose standards vary from mediocrity to excellence. Practically all these schools are publicly maintained and controlled, supervised and regulated by the State.

The other, which deals with a smaller number of pupils, from whom, however, most of the leaders in Church and State, in industry and the professions, and in society, are drawn, is based on a large number of private proprietary schools, mostly conducted for private profit, which have hitherto prided themselves on their independence, and a group of Public Schools which have for the most part so far maintained themselves with assistance from the State. I make this distinction not because it is unfamiliar to you, but merely for the sake of clearness:

for the problem of bringing Christianity into our education is quite distinct in the two cases.

What is the position in the State-aided day-school, if I may so term the first system, of which I propose to speak first?

It is presumably based on a partnership between the school and the home, and the school professedly leaves much to parental and ministerial teaching. Elementary education can only give the barest outline of religious knowledge, scraps alone of Old Testament history, imperfect opinions about the New: at best, some knowledge of the words of the Bible, some acquaintance with the stories. For our purpose the really formative years come at the secondary school from 12-18. The pupils who come there do not bring much with them from the elementary school: in the great majority of cases they bring still less from their homes, or from the churches or chapels which they attend: and when they arrive they get about forty-five minutes' introduction a week in a syllabus which may be on paper carefully planned, but which remains a lesson as to which in many schools no questions are ever asked. There are, besides, school prayers, which are apt to be perfunctory, as public prayers after a hurried breakfast and a hurried journey are apt to be. There are, so far as I know, in most of these schools no other opportunities.

It is often made a matter of boasting in these secondary schools that there is no religious problem, but I have to confess that this is mainly so, because there is uncommonly little religion. Lip service is paid to it, but it is mainly somebody else's business. It is supposed to be the business of the home-training. So it is, but then frequently, very frequently, there is no such training in the home. Or it is supposed to be the business of the Church to which the child belongs. But then frequently neither the child nor the parents go to church, or what is worse, the child is sent, and the parents do not go. It is idle to suppose that the Secondary Schools, as we know them, with their morning prayers and their one scripture lesson a week, are going to fill the gap. Nor is it in the least surprising, if one looks at the facts of the position, that the children grow up in this system to regard religion as not one of the things that really matter.

There are other causes at work. This is a province in which the teachers themselves do not see their way clearly. They do not know much about divinity or doctrine: they are inexperienced, not well-versed in the subject, and they are timid. They are mortally afraid of being unorthodox, and they therefore take refuge in making their scripture teaching purely historical, or purely verbal. They don't quite know where they are themselves, and therefore they give no lead. They frequently get out of giving the lesson at all if they can. They have all kinds of denominations represented in their classes, and that they find another reason for not committing themselves. The things that matter, the things that a child really thirsts for, do not depend in the least upon denominational distinctions, but because in the past the things of the denomination have mattered more than the things of Christ, we pay the price today in this 'aphasia' of the teachers.

We have to recognise, too, that many of the great opportunities are not within reach of the average Secondary School. It is not the custom for the masters and mistresses to prepare the pupils for Confirmation. It is not the custom for members of the school to attend Holy Communion together. Sunday is lost to them, and all the opportunities of Sunday. Seldom do the pupils hear a sermon specially addressed to them.

You may say that this does not matter so much if the atmosphere is right. But what is the atmosphere? It is one of competition through and through. The children are picked by competition from the elementary schools, they compete with one another in form after form throughout the secondary school, they compete at the end of it for further scholarships. They compete in their games. At home and at school they are urged to get the most out of themselves and to do well for themselves. They are more and more taught by specialist teachers whose horizon is limited by the subject which they teach. Such teachers may teach their subjects uncommonly well, but there are more things in heaven and earth, things which the child needs more, than Physical Geography or Oral French or the new Geometry. Is anyone teaching the things that matter? Can anyone teach them? I doubt it, but a man can set the example of them, if he gets the chance. My trouble

is this: as things are going, that chance grows steadily smaller.

I cannot but think that, as things are, in that great system of education which is in our country State-provided and controlled, one side, and that the most important side, of human nature in boy and girl, is being starved. The intellect is being looked after, and on the whole intellectual training improved; in some subjects standards tend to go up; the body also is being more and more looked after, and that also is to the good, but, I repeat, the spirit is being starved. The ideal of this education is efficiency, to make yourself a good chemist, a good business man, a capable modern language scholar, to provide yourself with the means of getting on, and commanding a good salary: and it is not that of service to God—not at bottom. The schools really aim at material success, and exult in testing themselves by material standards: and as the tree is, so will the fruit be. I am not for a moment denying that there are men and women, Heads and Assistants, who have different and higher ideals in these schools. Let us thank God that there are, for they are the salt of the earth, and counteract the vicious tendencies of the system under which they work in the only way in which they can be checked. But they are not very numerous in my experience, and they do not grow more numerous. Neither they nor the clergy have been able to prevent the mass of the population from growing up in such a way that they have no real knowledge of what Christ taught, and no real belief in Christianity, though they are not hostile to it. Only they do not act upon it. When we commemorated those who had fallen in the great war, we set up at Whitehall a cenotaph and wrote upon it, 'To our glorious dead.' It is a fine thing in its simplicity and in its restraint. It received general commendation. It does not happen to be Christian. It is said that this is right because it commemorates men of all creeds, men of all denominations within those creeds, and men of none. Let us give weight to that. But I cannot help feeling that if we had been Christian in reality we could not have been content with that cenotaph which commits nobody. We should have found in the Cross the symbol of our men's suffering, of their victory, and of the world's hope. We should have expressed a spiritual faith, but now we have

preferred to express nothing. Much of the same type appears our system of State education to be, and to the question 'What think ye of Christ?' it returns the answer, 'Of Christ we have no opinion, for that is not our business.'

If we turn now to what are known as the Public Schools, there is at any rate much greater opportunity. There is probably twice as much time devoted to the teaching of Scripture, and I should say that twice as much trouble is taken over it. But the same causes that operate to hinder teachers in the day schools operate to hinder them here also. Though they have reached a certain amount of agreement as to the methods of Old Testament teaching, there are still too many who treat it as a perfunctory lesson, and in dealing with the New Testament they exhibit a great deal of caution and conservatism. Not many of them are versed in modern criticism or are at home in theology. Most of them are hampered, as in the day schools, by the fear that if they let themselves go, they may be considered unorthodox, or may give offence to the old-fashioned parent of one of their pupils. Their own particular line of study lies in other directions, and in the scripture lesson they are content to play for safety. I do not say that the opportunities are not used, but they are not used to the full. And as a matter of fact, in a school where there are thirty forms, it is uncommonly hard to find thirty masters who are likely to take their Scripture teaching in dead earnest.

Confirmation gives a great opportunity which the day-school does not possess. I suppose that the House-master knows his boy more intimately than any minister can know his class under ordinary parochial conditions. It is an ideal chance, given the right man, for a boy's heart is open as it is not at other times. And I think the masters are sensible of the sacredness of the trust and the greatness of the chance, and that much more trouble and thought are expended over the preparation than used to be the case a generation ago. I can quote the Master of Wellington's authority for saying that in the few weeks preceding confirmation the religious life is deepest and most sincere. 'There is a moving of the waters then and many make the effort, and step in, and are made whole for the time at all events.' I think we shall all agree to that

in our experience, but there are some faults and there are some dangers. For one thing, the candidates are young: they have not come to their full intellectual growth: they do not know where their difficulties will be. The stirring of the waters is too often a stirring of the emotions, and therefore it tends to be transient. For another thing, too many masters, obsessed by their fear of moral dangers, make this a time for concentrating on certain particular moral issues, and so to my mind spoil most of the value of the occasion by associating it in the boy's mind with one particular moral fault and not with the whole life of service to God which it should open out to its view. There is finally almost everywhere a tendency to drop the candidates completely, so soon as they are confirmed: it seems strange that they should have so much care expended on them before the day, and should be so completely ignored once the day is past. I am not sure that this is wise, nor sure that the seedling when it has been put in the ground does not require some special watering and some particular treatment in order that it may strike root. I confess that I have not thought out a way. But I suspect that here may be one reason of the transient nature of confirmation upon some minds, and one cause among others of the reaction which can, and not altogether infrequently does, take place. The great danger of this period is that teacher and taught may mistake emotionalism for religion.

And next we have the Chapel Services about which argument is wont to rage. They are, so far as I know, in all schools compulsory. Well conducted, they are capable of exercising a singular power and making a compelling appeal. You see the corporate unity of the school before your eyes. And, as you hear all those voices swelling together in psalm or hymn to noble music, you can be lifted out of yourself. Are you lifted to God? I think so, sometimes, and in the case of some boys. It is easy to pick holes. Of course it is easy for the compulsory services to be too many, and hence to give rise to the oft-quoted remark of the Public School boy, who said that he had to go to so many chapels in his school career that he never wanted to go to church again. Well, as to him, I can't feel that he would have been a church-goer anyhow. We can

all find ingenious reasons for not doing what we do not want to do. Again, an attack is frequently made nowadays on the services just because they are compulsory: compulsion is foreign to the spirit of the time, and that which is compulsory is said to be deprived *ipso facto* of any value. But I do not honestly think that this is a feeling which spontaneously arises in boys' minds, except, perhaps, among members of the sixth form, who are beginning to question all things and to get their dialectical teeth cut.

All school life is based on compulsion and on certain compulsory work to which you are subjected while still immature for a term of years, and I cannot see any reason for making the chapel voluntary any more than the classroom. It seems to me unreasonable to apply the standards of adult life to boyhood, or to make people responsible before their time. Any schoolmaster knows, I suppose, what would happen if chapel attendance were made voluntary among boys, with their immature standards and their herd instincts. It would become the fashion for the members of one house to go, and of another not to go: the boy who wanted to go from a house where it was not 'the thing' would be in an unhappy position. And there would be some who would hesitate to go as often as they would like, because they would be afraid to be thought of as currying favour with the masters or one particular master. I cannot see any harm in the system of compulsory chapels so long as they are not too many and so long as the Holy Communion remains entirely voluntary, and no notice is taken whether a boy attends that service or does not. I am certain of this, that again and again the evening chapel brings rest and refreshment to the souls of both boys and masters, for it does take them away from the pressing worries and labours of the day, and gives them a chance of a few minutes' quiet in the presence of God. I say, 'I am certain,' because I know. I have seen what boys now lying in their graves have written to their parents about the School Chapel, and I do not think they lied.

And yet there is a feeling, I will not say a general feeling, but a feeling in many quarters that the schools are spiritually dead. And I suppose that the question is being urged among many groups of earnest workers in twos and threes in all the

Public Schools of the country whether anything can be done, and what can be done, to quicken the spiritual life of the schools. I am not sure that many of these men are not anxious to pluck fruit before it is ripe, and I do not know that they are at all clear what they mean and what they want. It may be my own stupidity, but it has never been clear to me what would be the easily recognized external characteristics of a school which was spiritually alive. I suppose Donald Hankey was spiritually alive, and is the sort of type that the schools would like to produce. He says that at Woolwich there was a small 'Pi squash' or Bible Class held weekly, but he only went once and didn't like it. He adds that he was always peculiarly sensitive about priggishness in those who professed themselves to be religious openly, and that he generally thought that he detected priggishness in any Bible circle or similar institution which he came across. 'My theology,' he adds, 'mainly consisted in speculations about the future state,' and his religion consisted in fairly regular attendance at Mattins and Communion. He seems, in other words, to have been externally a normal boy, and I can quite well imagine that a school which contained quite a number of Donald Hankeys would yet seem spiritually dead to some of the Hotspurs among the young chaplains and clerics. Whatever we do, we don't want to risk turning our schools into houses for breeding religious prigs. Still, I do not dismiss the criticism. I think it may be overhasty, and those who make it may not be clear what it is they seek. But you must judge the Public Schools by what they turn out, and they don't turn out many Donald Hankeys. They turn out some. But on the whole they turn out neutrals, men with a herd instinct, who are less afraid of a sin than of an offence against the traditions of their class. They don't get the general mass beyond this crowd morality and class standard, and to that extent they fail. And I have to admit that there are many who would state the failure in much more decided terms than I am inclined to do.

Granting this, it remains true that the picture which I have painted is not a rosy one of either the State Schools or the Public Schools. I have tried to be fair: there are some who would think more favourably of the State Schools, and some

who would think less favourably of the Public Schools, than I am inclined to do. Apart from that, I think I have drawn a picture with which most who know the schools would be inclined to agree.

I must turn now to the more constructive side of my remarks, and I wish that there were any one thing to which I could point which could be done at once, and would put us in the way of solving our problem. But I think we shall find that to bring Christianity into our education can only be done if we can bring the nation also back to Christ, and that will not be at once. At any rate, those who labour in both fields help each other all the time, and, if they succeed, will reap the same harvest. Now whatever the difference in the opportunities which are open to both types of school, there is one instrument which is available alike for both of them, and that is the Bible. We have to face the fact that in this country to a great extent we have at present lost the Bible. It is not our possession in the sense that it was the possession of our parents and our grandparents. We have abandoned a belief in verbal inspiration because it was untenable. We have abandoned a literal belief in the narrative of the Old Testament because it was untenable. We cannot go back to the position of our ancestors though we might wish to do so. But in abandoning their particular belief in the Bible we have far too much abandoned the Bible itself, and that is playing the very mischief with our religious teaching. It used to be read in the home carefully. Now it is not, and what is the good of forty-five minutes a week when there is no basis on which to work? A first practical step is for schools to try to come to some agreement about the teaching of the Bible, and to plan out a course, and I think that it could be done, by which children might so study the Bible from the first that they would have nothing to unlearn. But, if so, I would plead for greater frankness from the clergy in the Sunday pulpit, and less tolerance of ignorance. For just as the lay schoolmaster is apt to play for safety on the ground of the tender consciences of the pupils in his form, so the cleric is apt to play for safety on the ground that he must not offend the susceptibility of the old-fashioned member of his congregation. Both alike use that as an excuse

for not facing the issue themselves, and in both cases 'the hungry sheep look up and are not fed.' There are many difficulties in the problems of the Bible and of Church History, and it is no more good to preach as if they could be ignored than it is to teach as if they could be ignored. I must not stray away from my subject, and begin to dip into the special difficulties of the clergy: but it is obviously most important for the aim I have in view that there should not be one view of the Bible taught in the schools, and an obscurantist or obsolete view tolerated in the pulpit just because there are a certain number of old people, who have neither read nor thought for fifty years, sitting in the congregation. The young have their rights, and their rights are prior to those of the old.

So I come back again, after that particular outburst, to my point that the Bible ought to be taken seriously in all schools, and so taught from the earliest stages that the child should not have anything to unlearn. You may ask me, how is it to be so taught? A fair question, which to answer in full would require lectures on several evenings. I can only say this evening that I believe that it can be done, and ought to be done. May I venture to suggest some general principles? In teaching the Old Testament avoid the study of controversies, and don't burden the minds of the children with tasks of committing to memory complicated theories as to the origin of the Pentateuch, or the precise relation of the various parts of Isaiah to one another. It is not the business of the schools to make the children all Higher Critics in miniature, but to use the ascertained truths of criticism and to assume them. To make school boys and school girls study controversy as to origin and composition is to make them think that the whole work is very insecure and of doubtful validity. Nor are they interested. But start straight away from the position that the Old Testament is a great collection of books of human origin, of very varying degrees of power and inspiration, which, as you would expect, frequently conflict, but which do represent a steady advance from the lower to the higher, from the worship of many to the worship of One. And so from the outset you can accustom the minds of the pupils to think in terms of progressive revelation, and once they have that established as

a natural growth in their minds, they will be set free from more than half the problems which have vexed the minds of the young in the study of Holy Scripture. It is absolutely necessary to make this the whole foundation of our teaching, that God does give a fuller revelation of Himself as the ages pass, that all knowledge is to be welcomed from whatever sources it comes, and that there can be no conflict between religion and truth. I know no better way to implant this truth in a rudimentary form in a young mind than by studying the Old Testament in this way. It implies, of course, that you must give serious attention to the Prophets, because they led this great spiritual movement among the Hebrews. There need be no fear that they will not make their appeal to the young, if the teacher has studied his subject. Only your textbook must be the Bible, the actual words of the Bible, either the whole work from which the teacher can make his own selection, or a volume of selections : but let all outlines of Old Testament History, and similar cram books, however compendious, be consigned to the bottomless pit. I need not before this audience do more than refer to the literary treasures which exists in our Authorised Version and to the magnificent poetry of the prophetic books, to which twenty-five years ago I was never introduced at school. Let the children both read the Bible's own words, and learn some of the finest passages by heart. They will come back to them after many days. Finally, we want some good short commentaries for school use : commentaries exist, but they are too long. It is one of the few comforts that I derive from the prevalent high prices in all industry that the cost of printing much is prohibitive, and writers of commentaries, if they are to get them published at all, will have to be brief, especially when they write for schools.

In passing to the New Testament we reach more difficult ground, but the difficulties are frequently exaggerated. Again, I would say that it is no business of the schools to suggest problems which the children do not feel, and in which they are not interested. The teacher who of his own initiative propounds difficulties to the children, and calls it making them think, does unlimited harm. It is true to say of the New Testament that, though we have not reached so secure and

accepted a position as we have found in relation to the Old, yet we have travelled further towards a new and definite position than is often thought. No work has gone through such an ordeal of criticism as the New Testament in the last thirty years. Professor Moffatt, in the *Expository Times* of December, summing up his criticism, says that 'it has made it impossible any longer to regard this collection of books as a mosaic of texts to be fitted into proofs of dogmas. But it has also done away with the notion that the New Testament is the book of a timid, conventional little society, which shrank from contact with the facts of life, and sheltered itself behind pretty fancies about God and the world.' It is not. It is the book of a society which set itself to win the world, and which did win it, to face the facts of life and overcome them, and which did so overcome them. And we have to find that secret. That seems to me the spirit in which the New Testament should be approached in school. And therefore the main effort should be to give the children as clear a conception as possible of the personality of our Lord, to get back as far as possible to what He said, what He taught and what He did. Such a book as Mr. Glover's *The Jesus of History* is admirable for this purpose, and should set the note of our teaching. It follows that the main effort should be spent on the Gospels, and the rise of the Church: the study of the Epistles and the deeper study of St. Paul's teaching might with wisdom be reserved for the sixth form. What is needed is to get it into the atmosphere which surrounds the class that this study is the thing that supremely matters. I do not want the New Testament Lesson to become a sermon, but I want a class to feel not that they must prepare themselves to expound a parable to its last meticulous detail, not that they must make a careful list of all the miracles performed upon the Sabbath Day, but that here for them is the way of eternal life, here alone can the spirit be caught which shall transform the world.

I hope that I may not have spent too much time on this part of my topic, but I dare not underrate its importance. There can be no true Christianity save that based on the Bible, and our attitude towards that book has been changing for a couple of generations. It is always a difficult period when men are

passing from one standpoint to another, and in this case the transition has been particularly difficult. But unless I am wrong, we are not so far from safe footing on the other side, and if our footing is secure, the first thing we should do is to use our utmost effort to make the Bible again the possession of every child that grows up in a good home and a good school.

I am conscious that I have said a good deal, but I have not yet come to the root of the matter. It is not by taking thought that we shall bring Christianity into Education; we shall not do it either by careful revision of the school syllabus, or by improvement of our public services, or by a new devotion to music and a wise ritual, or by improved methods of reading. The plain truth of the whole question is that if the schools are spiritually dead, it is because the teachers are as a whole spiritually indifferent: if the boys and girls are conventional and unreal, it is because their teachers have not yet found their way out of convention and unreality. When we bracket Christianity and Education together, we should always bear in mind that Christianity cannot be taught. Religion cannot be taught. It cannot be taught by a teacher, it can be caught from a teacher, and only in that way does it pass and live. You must live Christianity, and then even without degree, diploma or training you will be a teacher of it.

The old proverb has it that it is an ill bird that fouls its own nest, and I do not like to criticise the profession to which I belong. If I do so, I want to say that I am quite conscious that I am not myself innocent. I have not been innocent of some of the faults which I allege, and I am well aware that there are exceptions, shining exceptions, to some of the general criticisms which I shall make.

There are two or three great dangers apparent to me in the present progress of English education, and the first that I would speak of is the danger introduced by the great increase in the number of specialist teachers. I mean by a specialist teacher one who devotes himself to the teaching of one subject throughout the school. We are used to them in mathematics. They are common in science. They have in the last twenty years made their appearance in modern languages, in history, in English, and in geography. They have done much good

inside their range: they have improved the teaching of some subjects out of recognition. But their range is much more limited than they are apt to think it, and to profess one subject out of a group of subjects which themselves form only a part of secondary education is to be a teacher, indeed, of that subject, but not a pastor or master. It is an odd and very valuable tradition of English education that every form should have a master whom it should see for a large number of hours a week, and who should be its 'guide, philosopher and friend.' Such a master has ceased to exist, or is ceasing to exist, in a great number of schools to-day. What is gained is higher intellectual attainment and better examination results: what is lost is moral influence. The form loses a good deal, and I submit that the teacher loses more. He is coming more and more to think that all that matters is the successful exposition of his subject, and less and less to believe that he is responsible for the character and the outlook on life of his pupils. This is steadily extending itself throughout our secondary education, and we are in danger of finding ourselves in the end with an education which is efficient, but non-moral and non-religious.

Such an education will be a very powerful instrument, but I do not think it will be a very serviceable instrument for building the Kingdom of God on earth. It is based on competition, worked by competition, and prepared for competition. The ideals are intellectual and not religious, and the majority of the teachers—the vast majority of the teachers—are ceasing to be held responsible, are ceasing to hold themselves responsible for anything but the intellectual and in some cases the physical well-being of those whom they teach.

Again, ever since I became a schoolmaster there has been incessant controversy and agitation over salaries. I feel some diffidence about speaking on this subject, since I have been lucky enough at all times to be a well-paid schoolmaster, and therein have differed from the great majority of my less lucky fellows. I have this consolation, that, though that is so, I have helped to agitate for better salaries, and I have helped to give better salaries. My conscience being clear in that respect, I want to say that no man who puts a serious value on money in the sense that he wants to leave something behind him, no one

who wants to make money, should enter the teaching profession. And I cannot disguise the feeling that during this prolonged salary agitation the moral standard of the profession has tended to go down. There is less unselfishness than there used to be; there is less other-worldliness than there used to be; there is, finally, rather less industry than there used to be. I do not say for a moment that the agitation was not necessary: a teacher should be able to marry and bring up his children and die somewhere else than in the poor-house. But you cannot conduct an agitation for material benefits over a long term of years without having some materialising effect on the young members of the profession, and the result at present is that though the material prospects were never better, the type that is coming forward to serve is not quite so good as it was.

For I feel that there is a real danger that school teachers may be missing the great secret which will alone give them the power to command success in the work of their career. Successful schoolmastering means not alone the power to teach a subject on the latest lines, not primarily the power to teach subjects at all, but the power to live a life. The school master's is a vocation as truly as that of any priest: into his hands are given the young, mind, body, and spirit—of a truth a sacred trust. Therefore one practical suggestion which I want to make both to those who are thinking of becoming teachers and to those who train them, is that more of them should be led to equip themselves seriously for the teaching of several subjects, particularly those of the humanities, not necessarily to an advanced stage; and should not only study some psychology and ethics, but also make up their own minds about religion. I want them to satisfy themselves that they have a 'call' before they enter upon this work, I want to see more young teachers presenting themselves who are qualified to be with their boys and girls for the greater part of the week, and to be the real shepherds of their forms. It will mean a great deal of effort, and a reversal of an existing tendency. For, as I have said, this conception of the pastor-teacher is dying out of the State-aided schools, and is declining in the Public Schools. The standard set up by the introduction of skilled special methods of instruction and the continually-felt pressure

of the examination room, have made the pace too hot for the old type of form master. But it need not be so, and the intellectual standards required are not too high to ask of the young man or woman of average intelligence if they will realise that the effort is worth making, because only so will they have a real formative influence on the mind and soul of their pupils.

I put the broader, deeper conception earnestly before the trainers of teachers. It is an old gibe at Head Masters that they do not believe in training. It is not a fair gibe; it is only fair to say that they are not entirely satisfied with hitherto existing methods of training. These have laid too much stress on teaching as an art, and too little on teaching as a vocation. The art of teaching is exceedingly valuable, but by itself it is not enough: it does not make the good schoolmaster or schoolmistress, it only makes the schoolmaster or schoolmistress who is certain of his own excellence. It leaves out of account that moral earnestness, that self-dedication, that sacred fire which transmutes all the drudgery of the class-room, and builds up the new life of the new generation. If you asked me to sum up the ideal for a teacher, I would venture to do so in a very few words: I would say to him, 'Know what you want your pupils to know: be what you want your pupils to be; and throw some enthusiasm into it.' Now the training of which we have experience has helped teachers to the first part, to know what they want their pupils to know, and to be able to impart that knowledge. So far, excellent. But it has not laid enough stress by any means on that second and hardest part, which may send some away very sorrowful, that you must seek to be that which you wish your pupils to be. But there is the secret in education. There is the requirement of vital importance. Only be honest and sincere and kindly, don't pretend to be, for your pupils will find you out inside a week, and never forgive you.

I may seem to have gone a long way round, but I have my end steadily in view, that the result of all our consideration must be that, if Christianity is to inspire our education, it can only be if the man and woman who teach are themselves Christians, if they actually live definitely Christian lives: not what they say, but what they are, will decide the matter. In

the position in which we find ourselves to-day, I seem to hear a clear call which goes out to all the teachers of the country that it is for them to listen to the call of the Spirit, and to open the ears of their pupils. They can do more than any others at this moment to bring the nation back to Christ; it is a call to all teachers, in the elementary schools, in the continuation schools, in the secondary schools, in the Universities. It is easy to point to the many difficulties. It is easy to point out that the children at school are what the homes make them, and the homes are what the world makes them, and the schools are the product of the demand of the homes and the world: it is all a vicious circle. Can it be broken? At any point? Yes, in the schools, if the teachers will do it. Standards that are nearer to the standards of Christ can there be taught to the coming generation, if the teachers find the grace and strength to make those standards their own. But hardly otherwise.

If it is done, if it is to be done at all, it will imply a good many changes, particularly in the attitude of the organized Churches to one another. I would like to keep this subject within due limits, but I cannot prevent it from widening out, for the subject of Christianity and Education cannot but be also a consideration of Christianity and the Nation of the future. You cannot get Christianity as a living, guiding force into the nation's education unless there is reunion or mutual recognition among Christians of all denominations. Every step forward that can be taken in this direction will make the task easier for the teachers in the schools, and will also inspire more teachers to the task. You cannot get Christianity as a living, guiding force into the nation's education unless the whole teaching in the Churches moves back to Christ, the Author and Finisher of our Faith. He did not found a society, but he left a message, a gospel, which must be continuously reinterpreted and reapplied. We have got to apply that Gospel to this half-wrecked civilization which the war has left us. We have therefore to face the fact that the result of this teaching will be revolutionary, in that much in our present order will be changed out of knowledge, since it is plainly contrary to all that our Lord taught. We shall no longer stultify ourselves, as every honest Christian must feel in his heart that he is

stultified by the course of events since the Armistice, when having fought and won a war in order to build a new world, we find ourselves feverishly patching and mending the old in the spirit of the old in the hope that it will stand up for our time.

But patching old garments is not the spirit of the young whom we have to educate, and I hope that this is not the spirit of the teachers. The spirit of the young and earnest to-day is spoken, I believe, in the recent manifesto of the Student Christian Movement, when they say, 'The world is at a crisis when we believe that Christians must attack or fail. Society has to be reordered. Through Christ men have the power to do it.' And again later in the same document, 'The issue before us is a straight fight with the power of evil. Only in and through human lives can the power of God become effective.' They, too, speak of social changes; they, too, speak of reunion. It is not mere rhetoric. It is the voice of a real crusade. And among these human lives which can make the power of God effective, most numerous and most influential are the teachers of the country, if they will but hear the call and dedicate themselves to the work. I would have them take rank in the nation, I would have them consciously devote themselves to their work as a lay ministry, members of a sacred calling, since on them, more than on any others, is laid the responsibility for the future of the world.

For it is the world's regeneration that is in debate. I do not know how this visible world will end or what will be the fate of our present civilization and faith. So far as I can tell, it may go down in disaster, it may become a nobler thing than before. I know that it can only be saved by obeying the teaching of Christ, and I know that, whether its fate is to be success or failure, depends in part upon me: it depends in part upon every teacher. And this is the quest, the great adventure to which I would have all teachers summon the taught, because they ride as leaders in it themselves, for if they do, the boys and girls, the young men and women, will follow. Only let us look forward and not back, let us preach hope, and reach out to the things that are before us, and let the end of our service find us, if not victorious, at any rate unconquered.

AN EIGHTEENTH CENTURY MORALIST

By Alfred Fawkes, M.A., Vicar of Ashby St. Ledgers; Hon. Chaplain to the Bishop of Hereford.

THE two greatest names in English apologetic are Butler and Paley. The *Analogy* of the first, and the *Evidences* of the second, have formed the tradition, the one of the Oxford, the other of the Cambridge, theological school. The ground, however, has shifted; while effective as an answer to eighteenth century Deism, neither work is very convincing to-day. But neither Butler nor Paley should be judged by his most widely read treatise. The *Fifteen Sermons upon Human Nature* (1729) are as cogent on their own ground as they were when they were written; the *Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy* (1785) retain their place in, and need not fear comparison with, the ethical thought of later time. Paley, in particular, represents the English mind, if not at its highest, certainly at its best. The outlook of the professional advocate, whether of religion or morals, is foreign to him. Of the training on which this outlook follows, it has been said: '*Une formation spéciale et défectueuse crée nécessairement une mentalité particulière et inférieure.*'[1] He had no trace of this caste bias; his is the open, or lay, mind.

His characteristic quality was good sense. He did not affect indifference to his career. In 1772 he refused to sign a petition in favour of a modification of the Subscription to the XXXIX Articles then required as a condition of matriculation, on the plea that 'he was too poor to keep a conscience.' The remark is sufficient proof that his sympathies were an open secret; and there were limits beyond which his opportunism would not go. He chose as a divinity thesis for his B.D. degree the non-eternity of future punishment. Later, in his *Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy*, he suggests that there may be 'little to choose between the condition of the worst man who is received into heaven, and that of the best who is excluded'; and in 1785 when he was warned that the parable of the pigeons, in that famous book, would hinder his being made a

[1] *Autour d'un Petit Livre*, A. Loisy, XXXV.

Bishop, his answer was, 'Well, Bishop or no Bishop, let it stand.' The passage which is said to have given lasting offence to George III is as follows:—

> 'If you should see a flock of pigeons in a field of corn; and if (instead of each picking where and what it liked, taking just as much as it wanted and no more) you should see ninety-nine of them gathering all they got into a heap; keeping this heap for one, and that the weakest, perhaps worst, pigeon of the flock; sitting round and looking on, all the winter, while this one was devouring, throwing about and wasting it; and if a pigeon more hardy or hungry than the rest touched a grain of the hoard, all the others instantly flying upon it, and tearing it to pieces; if you should see this, you would see nothing more than what is every day practised and established among men. Among men you see the ninety-and-nine toiling and scraping together a heap of superfluities for one (and this one, too, oftentimes the feeblest and worst of the whole set, a child, a woman, a madman or a fool); getting nothing for themselves all the while but a little of the coarsest of the provision, which their own industry produces; looking quietly on, while they see the fruits of all their labour spent or spoiled; and if one of the number take or touch a particle of the hoard, the others joining against him, and hanging him for the theft.'

Paley justifies the institution of property, 'which, in the view of it above given, is so paradoxical and unnatural,' on purely utilitarian grounds, and denies it any mystical or metaphysical sanction; the foundation of the right to property is 'the Law of the Land.' This was very plain speaking. It could only have come from a man open to the best influences of his generation; and it is greatly to Paley's credit that he should have refused to let the liberty of the thinker be stifled by the interest or professional instinct of the priest.

Such disinterestedness was exceptional. The frank place-hunting of the clergy of the time was, perhaps, not more offensive than the veiled self-seeking of a later period; but it was very much more transparent. When Paley's patron, Edmund Law, Bishop of Carlisle, was dying, his son, afterwards Lord Ellenborough, was engaged in Assize business at the cathedral city. The Bishop's death was hourly expected; and a horse was kept saddled at Rose Castle so that a message might be despatched immediately to inform his son of the event. When this messenger arrived in Carlisle, he found that not all his haste had prevented the news getting there before him; and an eager applicant had already set off for London to secure the Minister's influence in the succession to the see. Readers of Anthony Trollope will recall the chapter in *Barchester Towers*

in which the conflicting feelings with which Archdeacon Grantly watched his father's life slowly ebbing are described.

The *Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy*, of which a German translation appeared in 1788, owes much to Abraham Tucker (1705—1774), in whose *Light of Nature Pursued* Paley found 'more original thinking and observation than in any other writer—not to say in all others put together.' The prolixity of this work deters the modern reader; Mackintosh describes its author as 'a metaphysical Montaigne.' The epithet must be taken in a loose sense; and not even so could it be applied to Paley, who is thoroughly English, in being thoroughly unmetaphysical. He has little care for system; his argument, though based as a whole upon utility, stands side by side with reasonings drawn from another and an older school. Thus, while losing something of the demonstration of the later Utilitarianism, he avoids its dogmatic paradox; he would rather be inconsistent than absurd. The instinctive judgment of the 'plain, honest man,' to which Butler, with the intuitional school, appeals, seems to him an insufficient basis for morality; he distrusts theory, and will not readily leave the solid ground of facts. What are called the moral instincts can be accounted for in other and more obvious ways than intuition;—here he lays particular stress on the process of association. These instincts exhibit no uniformity, he adds; they 'bend to circumstances'; 'upon the whole, it appears to me, either that there exist no such instincts, or, that they are not to be distinguished from prejudices and habits—on which account they cannot be depended upon in moral reasoning.' And 'the laws of custom are very apt to be mistakes for the order of nature. For which reason I suspect that a system of morality built upon instincts will only find out reasons and excuses for opinions and practices already established—and will seldom correct or reform either.' This suspicion suggests itself in connection with certain bye-paths of modern thinking, which may be described as reasons for believing without evidence—*i.e.* for irrational belief. Tulloch's criticism of the *Grammar of Assent* is that it is rather an ingenious elaboration of the fact 'that men hold certain beliefs than a justification either of these beliefs or of their acceptance.' 'Assent divorced from reason can be nothing but

credulity; and Dr. Newman's assent is nothing else' (*Edinburgh Review*, October, 1870). *Matière et Mémoire* is a more scientific work than the *Grammar of Assent*. But the present vogue of the Bergsonian philosophy would have been displeasing to the eighteenth century mind.

In the chapter on the Divine Benevolence we find the well-known reflection: 'I seem to see the benevolence of the Deity more clearly in the pleasures of very young children than in anything in the world.' And he concludes that 'God wills and wishes the happiness of his creatures,' so that 'the method of coming at the will of God concerning any action by the light of nature is to inquire into the tendency of that action to promote or diminish the general happiness.' Nor does he shrink from the consequences of this position. The term happiness denotes 'a certain state of the nervous system in that part of the human frame in which we feel joy and grief, passion and affection'; and 'pleasures differ in nothing but in continuance and intensity.' The frankness of these admissions will dispose the reader to accept the writer's warning against the danger of misconception. 'There is scarcely any delusion by which men are greater sufferers in their happiness than by their expecting too much from those intense delights which vulgarly usurp the name of pleasure. The very expectation spoils them.' 'Neither, on the other hand, does happiness consist in the apathy, or ataraxy of the old philosophers:

> 'For which reason the expectations of those who retire from their shops and countinghouses to enjoy the remainder of their days in leisure and tranquility are seldom answered by the effect; much less of such as in a fit of chagrin shut themselves up in cloisters or hermitages, or quit the world and their station in it for solitude and repose.'

Again, in this connection he speaks of the 'intolerable vacuity of mind which carries the idle rich to gambling and racing—pursuits in which the possibility of success bears no proportion of the certainty of solicitude'; and of 'the peevishness of monks and such as lead a monastic life.' And over-refinement of reasoning misleads. Appearances may no doubt deceive; but 'though the apparent happiness of mankind be not always the measure of their real happiness, it is the best measure we have.' The conclusion being—

> 'First, that happiness is pretty equally divided amongst the different orders of civil society.

> 'Secondly, that vice has no advantage over virtue, even with respect to this world's happiness.'

With the Aristotelian reflection that 'man is a bundle of habits'; and the reminder that virtue is positive—'a state of mere unprofitableness will not go unpunished'—the first part of the book ends.

It is the utility of any moral rule, and this alone, which is the ground of its obligation. 'Actions are to be estimated by their tendency. Whatever is expedient is right.' The consideration of *general* consequences—to which Paley gives prominence; and which is conclusive against the refinements of casuistry—hinders this maxim from degenerating into licence in the case of individuals and Machiavellianism in that of communities. What are called *casus conscientiæ* may with few exceptions be solved by the distinction between particular and general, immediate and remote results. The particular consequence (*e.g.*) of coining is the loss of a guinea to the person who receives the counterfeit coin; the general consequence is the disuse of money as a means of exchange. Hence the severity with which it is punished; and what seems to some the harshness of the English law towards offences against property: in an industrial community such offences touch the springs of life. On social ethics he is in many respects in advance of his generation. A man, *e.g.*, who misuses his influence as a voter or a patron commits a graver crime than many a violation of what moralists call a 'perfect' right. Homely duties, such as the avoidance of waste, are put on a religious foundation; the claim of the brute creation is placed high—the slaughter of animals for food can scarcely, he thinks, be justified by natural law. The freedom of the seas—the *mare liberum*—is proclaimed. The navigation of home waters may be restricted; but

> 'When Spain asserts her right to the Pacific Ocean, and Portugal to the Indian Seas, or when any nation extends its pretensions much beyond the limits of its own territories, they erect a claim which interferes with the beneficent designs of Providence, and which no human authority can justify.'

A lie is a breach of promise, an engagement to veracity being involved in the notion of discourse.

> 'Pious frauds, as they are improperly enough called, pretended inspirations, forged books, counterfeit miracles . . . . may sometimes,

> though seldom, have been set up and encouraged with a design to do good. But the good they aim at requires that the belief of them should be perpetual—which is hardly possible; and the detection of the fraud is sure to disparage the credit of all pretensions of the same nature. Christianity has suffered more injury from this cause than from all other causes put together.'

Nor does the tendencious historian escape. There may be lies of omission. A writer of English history—the reference to Hume is obvious—

> 'Who, in his account of the reign of Charles the First, should wilfully suppress any evidence of that prince's despotic measures and designs, might be said to lie; for by entitling his book *A History of England*, he engages to relate the whole truth of that history, or at least all that he knows of it.'

Of Oaths, 'in no country in the world are their forms worse contrived either to convey the meaning, or to impress the obligation, of an oath than in our own.' As becomes a Whig of '88, he repudiates non-resistance. The Oath of Allegiance 'permits resistance to the king, when his ill behaviour or imbecility is such as to make resistance beneficial to the community.' That this is the *animus imponentis* is clear from the fact that this oath comes to us from the Convention Parliament of 1688. It does not require obedience to such commands of the king as are unauthorized by law; nor does it apply to a king who is not so *de facto*. The relation of ruled and rulers is reciprocal, and lapses when the ruler no longer rules. At the same time the Social Contract is rejected, as unfounded in its principle and dangerous in its application.' The only ground of the subject's obligation is 'the will of God, as collected from Expediency.'

His account of the ethics of subscription will not satisfy those who attempt to exploit the formularies of the English Church as a barrier against the application of critical and scientific methods to theology. With reference to the XXXIX Articles, under which (Art. VIII) the Three Creeds fall, 'the legislature of the 13th Elizabeth (1571) is the imposer'; and the intention was 'to exclude from office in the Church

1. All abettors of Popery:
2. Anabaptists; who were at that time a powerful party on the Continent:
3. The Puritans; who were hostile to an Episcopal constitution: and in general the members of such leading sects or foreign establishments as threatened to overthrow our own.'

It is only by a palpable anachronism that the Articles can be held to apply to later controversies; persons who do not fall under one of these three categories are entitled to subscribe. To question this right is 'to apply a rule of law to a purpose for which it was not intended. Under which description,' he adds,—with a quaint reminiscence of obsolete but at the time unrepealed legislation—'may be ranked an officious revival of the laws against Popish priests and dissenting teachers.'

The authority of a Church Establishment is founded on its utility; 'other motives and ends have served only to debase the institution and to introduce into it numerous corruptions and abuses.' And 'it cannot be proved that any form of Church Government was laid down in the Christian Scriptures with a view of fixing a constitution for succeeding ages.' Paley would have held, with Selden, that 'they are equally mad who say bishops are so *jure divino* that they must be continued; and they who say, they are so anti-Christian that they must be put away. All is as the State likes.' He is a Church Reformer; 'the great length of Church services is unfavourable to piety'; and he would have the Psalms and Lessons either left to the choice of the minister, or better accommodated to the capacity of the audience and the edification of modern life.' The liturgy should also contain 'as few controverted propositions as possible . . . Why should every position which the Church maintains be woven with so much industry into the forms of public worship?' The reference seems to be to the Athanasian Creed. He was also what would now be called a Liberal Churchman. The Reformers 'had exonerated Christianity of a weight which sunk it'; and

> 'He who, by a diligent and faithful examination of the original records, dismisses from the system one article which contradicts the apprehension, the experience, or the reasoning of mankind, does more towards recommending the belief, and, with the belief, the influence of Christianity, to the understandings and consciences of serious inquirers, and through them to universal reception and authority, than can be effected by a thousand contenders for creeds and ordinances of human establishment.'

This absence of professional or pietistic bias gives weight to his famous criticism of Gibbon:

> 'Who can refute a sneer? Who can compute the number, much less, one by one, scrutinize the justice, of these disparaging insinuations which crowd the pages of this elaborate history? What reader

> suspends his curiosity, or calls off his attention from the principal narrative, to examine references, to search into the foundation, or to weigh the reason, propriety, and force, of every transient sarcasm and sly allusion, by which the Christian testimony is depreciated and traduced; and by which, nevertheless, he may find his persuasion afterwards unsettled and perplexed?'

Slavery excites his indignation. The American Revolution, he believes, will conduce, 'and who knows but that it was designed?—to accelerate the fall of this abominable tyranny'; and his trust in the British Parliament is limited; it is open to question 'whether a legislature which has so long lent its support to the support of an institution replete with human misery, is to be trusted with an Empire the most extensive ever attained in any age or generation of the world.'

The Duel is condemned; nor will he distinguish the guilt of the challenged from that of the challenger. With regard to Divorce, while confining it to 'the single case of adultery in the wife,' he allows re-marriage. His attitude towards the question as a whole, while leaning to rigorism, is eminently unmystical; the reason for the permanence of marriage is not the sacramental nature of the contract, but the public good. The good of the individual must give way to that of the community.

> 'If a married pair, in actual and irreconcilable discord, complain that their happiness would be better consulted by permitting them to determine a connection which is become odious to both, it may be told them that the same permission, as a general rule, would produce libertinism, dissension and misery amongst thousands who are now virtuous and quiet and happy in their condition; and it ought to satisfy them to reflect that, when their happiness is sacrificed to the operation of an unrelenting rule, it is sacrificed to the happiness of the community.'

He is an advocate of the House of Lords; but from no very flattering view of the capacity of hereditary legislators. 'We do not suppose the nobility to be more unprejudiced than others; we only suppose that their prejudices will be different from, and may occasionally counteract, those of others.' A proposition to which the most stalwart Radical may agree. On the Criminal Law he is behind Beccaria and the continental jurists of his school. He justifies 'the multiplicity of capital offences' under the then existing English law on the ground that these laws were never meant to be carried into indiscriminate execution. 'By this expedient few actually suffer death,

whilst the dread and danger of it hang over the crimes of many'; a fact which to a modern jurist supplies an additional argument against the odious system which Paley defends. On tariffs and commercial legislation he is sound; he was a Free Trader before Free Trade.

> 'As in many subjects, so especially in those which relate to commerce, to plenty, to riches, and to the number of people, more is wont to be expected from laws than laws can do. . . . The natural basis of trade is rivalship of quality and price; or, which is the same thing, of skill and industry. Every attempt to *force* trade by operations of law, that is, by compelling persons to buy goods at one market which they can obtain cheaper and better from another, is sure to be either eluded by the quick-sightedness and incessant activity of private interest, or to be frustrated by retaliation. One half of the commercial laws of many states are calculated merely to counteract the restrictions which have been imposed by other States. Perhaps the only way in which the interposition of law is salutary in trade is in the prevention of fraud.'

More, perhaps, than any one writer—with the possible exception of Horace—Paley has left his mark on our English Public School and University training; and so on the national mind. Oxford has been the home of ideas and the starting point of movements. Both are partial and passing. Cambridge has been the University of common sense—which, if it appears to enthusiasts dull, and if at times it degenerates into common nonsense, 'never faileth'; it has worn, it wears, and it will continue to wear well. The Age of System is over; what to a generation brought up under T. H. Green, and even Henry Sidgwick, seemed Paley's defects, are now counted to him for righteousness; his distaste for the schematized, and for abstractions; his persistent appeal to utility and expediency; his inclination to rule of thumb. Pattison notices the curious, and purely English, connection between the Catholic revival and an *a priori* philosophy (*Memoirs*, p. 167). Both are on the wane. And the anomaly of the latter having been 'imported into Oxford by a sound Liberal, the late Professor Green, can only be accounted for,' he adds unkindly, 'by a certain puzzle-headedness on the part of the Professor, who was removed from the scene before he had time to see how eagerly the Tories began to carry off his honey to their hive.' The thinking of the twentieth century is falling back upon that of the eighteenth. Sense, reinforced by more exact knowledge, is taking the place of the cloudy and loose-textured notions of the intermediate age.

SOME IMPRESSIONS OF THE CHURCH IN INDIA

By J. Worsley Boden, M.A.[1]

IT is a commonplace alike in literature and in conversation to represent the religion of the English, or (as we must now describe it) the European, society in India as a farce. When Mr. Lowes Dickinson was Albert Khan Fellow and wrote his impressions,[2] he dismissed the religion of the English in India with a mocking allusion to an Anglican hymn, and explained the lingering practice of church-going as part of a social system which he has shown that he does not approve. He would admit the Christian convention, but would give no credit for Christian conviction. A travelling journalist is perhaps less penetrating and dogmatic, but is no less allusive and aloof. In his light, yet strangely enlightening, sketches of life in India, the late Mr. G. W. Steevens provided a few brief lines on the Indian Sunday, when men make up arrears of work (or go for a day's shooting), and for women there is the cantonment church if they want it.[3] Such scant references suggest only too sharply the impressions which the Church in India makes on observers who come with no particular desire to be impressed by it. They do contain a half-truth. The Church does not appear in the limelight. If it be true in England that 'in an age of advertisement the Church of England does not advertise' its activity, it might be said that in India it allows without protest the repeated advertisement of its passiveness. The impression is abroad that the Church is ineffective. 'Give a dog a bad name and hang him' is as true of institutions as of animals; and under the influence of persistent obloquy the institution, like the animal, begins to acquiesce in the sentence.

It would, no doubt, be difficult to fix the root cause of the

[1] The writer was for some time Supply Officer Divisional Troops, 2nd (Rawal Pindi) Division; and for over three years held the licence of the Bishop of Lahore to assist, and to act for, the Chaplains of Rawal Pindi.

[2] G. Lowes Dickinson, *Appearances*, pp. 3, 4, 17. (Dent.)

[3] G. W. Steevens, *In India*, p. 284. (Nelson.)

unfortunate ailment which appears to depress the life of the Church in India. The climate covers a multitude of sins. The contagion of the Oriental atmosphere undermines the virility of the English character. The vexing problems of official life tend to occupy and to harass the conscientious Government servant to the exclusion of his unofficial interests. The same problems drive the less diligent to a counter concentration on his own interests. In both directions the effect is to turn attention from the life of unofficial duty, and in a large measure to reduce church-going to the minimum which official occasions dictate. This brief enumeration of causes would, perhaps, imply that of all the claims upon the time and energy of the European society —the office, the club, the golf links, and so forth—the Church is the first to be squeezed out by the pressure of duty or distraction. This is a clear confession of weakness; and it would be amazing, in these days of ecclesiastical self-condemnation, if no charge were to be laid against the Church for its failure to take a higher place in the affections of its members. It would not be difficult to show that the Church suffers within from a number of the influences which depress it from without. Its personnel are not more proof against the sun or the temperature than other mortals; they tread the same soil, breathe the same atmosphere, catch the contagion of the same Oriental corruption, acknowledge in their own service the same general obligations to the Government. The chaplains of the Indian Ecclesiastical Establishment bear the normal burden of Government Officials. That is the price which they pay for the 'liberty of prophesying'; and to fasten on the State connection as the cause of ecclesiastical depression is to strain at a gnat. There is no need to adopt the current fashion of attributing it wholly or mainly to the fact of Establishment. Nay, a candid and penetrating observer would rather conclude that in the peculiar conditions of India the best hope of English religion lies in the independence which the Establishment secures to the chaplains.

It will be manifest that by 'the Church' is meant His Majesty's Ecclesiastical Establishment, and primarily the Church of England. The Establishment does not include any of the Missionary settlements, which co-exist with established

churches in cantonments, and exist in many other places which have no chaplains. But it is to be noted that the Establishment includes four denominations: the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, the Roman Catholic and the Wesleyan Churches. The Indian branches of the two National Churches are established by the State and staffed by Government chaplains, who are appointed by the Secretary of State and placed in charge of cathedral or cantonment churches. The chaplains of the Roman Catholic and Wesleyan communities are not appointed by the Secretary of State, but receive grants from the Government for the provision of services for British troops and other European adherents to their churches.

The Church of England, as it exists for Europeans, is thus a department of Government; and in each presidency or province the head of the department is the Bishop. Yet not all the Bishops are State officials. The Bishops of Chhota Nagpur and some other Dioceses are external to the Establishment, and are paid from voluntary funds; but that does not hinder their jurisdiction over Government chaplains in charge of European stations in their Dioceses. On the other hand, the Bishops of the Establishment have jurisdiction as well over the voluntary as over the established churches in their Diocese. The Bishops of the three Presidency Dioceses of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras, the whole of whose official incomes are paid by Government, and of the Provincial Dioceses of Lahore, Lucknow, Nagpur and Rangoon, who receive from Government the pay of senior chaplains (which is increased by an additional income from endowments), are called upon to administer Dioceses in which the missionary clergy greatly outnumber the official chaplains.

These details will seem wearisome enough to some ecclesiastical enthusiasts, who cannot contemplate without impatience the hard reality of religious dependence on secular support. But the details are indispensable to such an understanding of the Church in India as shall be proof against the too facile criticism of the idealists of 'spiritual independence.' There are certainly not too many Bishops in India; and they cannot be said to be overpaid. The Bishop of Lahore administers a Diocese which includes the Punjab, the North-west Frontier

Province, Kashmir, Sind, Baluchistan and the Persian Gulf; and his pay, even calculated at the present rate of exchange, is no more than £2,000 a year. If the chaplains are more liberally paid than most of the clergy in England, the difference is more than warranted by a life of exile some 6,000 miles from their natural homes. To attempt to remedy a lax churchmanship by removing the Ecclesiastical Establishment could hardly fail to reduce the number of clergy and to impair the efficiency of those who remain. It is inconceivable that, if ministrations in cantonment churches depended upon voluntary organization and endowment, the churchfolk would put their chaplain on an adequate financial basis. The chaplain of an official community is expected to live up to official standards. No good can be done by depreciating the importance of social requirements in such a society; and these cannot properly be met with the stipend of a missionary. A missionary, moreover, normally receives a free house, and often a more pretentious one than the chaplain is able to rent; and, again, it is highly doubtful whether a non-official chaplain would receive, over and above an inevitably reduced income, the cost of renting even his present house. Too much controversial capital is sometimes made on both sides out of the relative positions of chaplains and missionaries. The latter remark the official affluence of the former; the former cannot fail to be struck by the unofficial prosperity of the latter. The difference between the two types has been proposed in a riddle to which the answer runs: A chaplain is one who works through the hot weather while the more fortunate of his parishioners go to the cool of the hills; a missionary is one who resorts to the hills while his people remain to toil in the heat of the plains.

A too cruel jest at the expense of the missionary nevertheless records a not unfaithful impression of many chaplains on the Indian Establishment. A conscientious chaplain has not an easy life. He has every inducement to use an independent position to reduce his routine to the least possible measure, which is consistent with the elastic self-respect induced by the Indian atmosphere. The struggle is thus intensified by the temptation to evade it. Nevertheless, the chaplains not uncommonly perform their duties without remission. They hold

their regular services, visit the military hospitals, keep up their social relationships with the club folk, are tactful or courageous, retiring or prominent, as the circumstances of cantonment life should seem to require. This co-existence of admitted virtues is not, of course, invariable; nor, perhaps, is it to be found in any one person. For chaplains have their specialities, and concentrate on one or another fashion of ecclesiastical or social activity. But it would not be excessive to say that, for all the examples which the curious and convinced may cite to the contrary, many of the chaplains get through a vast amount of inconspicuous and honest work. The official system keeps them at their office tables filling up Government forms, when they would be more profitably employed in reading theology; and, if, when they are thoroughly exhausted by hours of concentration upon elaborate, apparently irrelevant, but officially necessary returns, the social system drags them out upon a tennis-court, nobody, perhaps, will be surprised that the intellectual life frequently falls into desuetude, and that the Sunday sermons degenerate into sermonettes or lapse into empty and protracted platitudes. The difficulties which confront the chaplains are irritating and seductive; and if it be said that men all too commonly go down before them, it is not for the sake of a captious cut at human weakness, but only to emphasise the extreme importance of a careful choice of personnel. In the conditions suggested above, it may be taken as general that the pressure of the system will squeeze out of the chaplain's routine all that seems to be dispensable. What *must* be done will be done. What is not apparently vital will go by the board. Serious reading will be the first of a man's habits to go by default; and with its lapse his preaching, which, rightly or wrongly, is the touchstone of church attendance, will decline and fail.

Since this is unhappily, a not uncommon phenomenon, the reader will rightly conclude that Modernism has not seriously invaded the pulpits of the Indian Establishment. With equal assurance he may believe that there is ample room for it. It is true that a few of the older supporters of the Church in some stations are wedded to their traditional forms and phrases and to the conceptions which they connote, and consequently

stand aghast at the ventilation of the new learning; but it is truer still that a large body of persevering church-goers is wearied by the dull vacuity of the pulpit, and welcomes the light and leading of modern and intelligible discourse. There is, moreover, outside the ranks of regular or even occasional church-goers, a great body of men who stand aloof from what they conceive to be the preaching of a 'creed outworn.' They are commonly set down by churchmen as indifferent and irreconcilable. They are said to have no intellectual interests—a facile criticism in India, where such interests tend everywhere to be at a discount. Yet they are often men of as much goodwill as their critics, and are certainly not less intelligent. Many of them might be the making of the Church of the future, if only the Church of the present had a larger, a more lively, and a more liberal spirit. The opportunities before the chaplains of the Indian Establishment are immense: their parochial charges commonly offer what one strong and valued chaplain described as 'much bigger work than the average parish in England'; and there is no excuse for the depreciation of their office both by word and work in which, unhappily, they sometimes indulge. It is a scandal that British troops, brought out to India in war-time and required to parade for church, should find themselves in a station where the chaplain deliberately depresses Parade Service, by reading it inaudibly and with no care for reverence, in order to exalt a choral Eucharist which is voluntary. A chaplain has to remember that he is the officer of an Imperial Service, and one of his first duties is to the troops in his station. While Parade Services continue to be required by authority, they must be accepted as normal channels of spiritual service, as opportunities of drawing men to God, not of driving them to sullen indifference or violent revolt. Some of the published works of army chaplains during the war disclosed the discovery that great numbers of men on service had never been in the habit of attending a church. Most of the working clergy were aware of this without having to go on service to find it out. But what must be their disappointment when they learn that the experience of some of these men, when forced into a church for the first time since their childhood, has only confirmed them in their old habit, and transformed apathy

into antipathy? So extreme an abuse as the above is probably, and happily, rare. But that one can be attested; and the conduct of Parade Services as a whole tends to be slovenly and uninspiring.

If the position of a chaplain makes him primarily a spiritual counsellor to the troops, he remains, nevertheless, the official of a civil department, and, subject to the Bishop's oversight, his own master. In that position of independence he is given unique opportunities of bridging the gaps in the varied society of India. He can maintain relations with the Scottish chaplain, with the Wesleyan chaplain and with the Roman Catholic chaplain, and will normally take the lead in organizing united services on special occasions. In another direction he has the opportunity of lending the support of his church to the local branch of one or other of the recognized Missionary Societies, and promoting some measure of fellowship between the English churchmen of the cantonment and the Indian Christians in the *bazar* or the city. And in a wider sphere he takes his place with all Englishmen, who, in whatever walk of life, sustain the Christian character in a country of strange, enigmatic, acutely observant and silently critical people.

The Indian Empire demands the Church's best endeavours. Opponents of the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms are wont to say that India will shortly cease, if it has not already ceased, to be fit for white men to inhabit. The rise of the Indian to political power in his own country will diminish the prestige of the British ruling class, and tend to lower the type of personnel which the Government of India draws from Home to fill the Civil and Military Services. So it is urged. But, even if it be true, it cannot be held to diminish the claims upon the Church. There is no room for a corresponding decline in the type of chaplain. Rather will the new conditions tend to magnify the Church's obligations. For, on the hypothesis of the *non-placets* of the reforming measures, the relations of European and Indian will be embittered by the waxing rivalry of the latter, and further aggravated by the waning quality of the former. The tax on the Christian character, which in the conditions of the East is always heavy, will be accentuated; and accordingly the need of guidance and of inspiration will be in-

creased. It is unfortunate, though frequently true, that men who are taking Orders in England go uninformed of the claims of the Indian Establishment, unless they happen to have some Indian connection. It could be wished that when Bishops of the Church in India are on leave in England, and seek to commend to their audiences the growing needs of the Mission field, they should not omit to proclaim the existence and the requirements of the Ecclesiastical Establishment. The impressions of the Church in India which we cited at the outset are sufficiently invited by the inconspicuous place which it might seem to hold in the life of society. Yet, as we shall show in conclusion, it has its inspiring moments.

On a gala day in a large cantonment the Church comes into its own. It becomes the gathering place of all Englishmen who have not cast away every profession of religion or of churchmanship. Christmas Day is known among the Indians as the Sahib's *Burra Din*.[4] On Christmas Day the Station turns out for Parade Service in the morning, in the immemorial fashion of the Race which it represents. The notables appear in the seats which, though sometimes empty, are always reserved for them; the Commissioner who is the chief Civil Officer; the Army Commander and other Generals; other Officers occupy their places of precedence, some with wives and families; British troops of the garrison fill the rest of the church. The expanse of military uniforms and the arms of the troops hint darkly at the perils through which an Empire survives; the more sombre dress of the Civil Service suggests the quiet yet immense achievements of British justice and administration; the chaplain, whose apparel proclaims him the emissary of an historic Church and an ancient University, carries the symbols of piety and learning into the exile of his fellow-countrymen in a Dominion beyond the seas. 'Far away, over boundless seas and deserts,' the English Church draws its sons to a service which is peculiarly English. Among 'dusky nations living under strange stars, worshipping strange gods, and writing strange characters from right to left,'[5] the church is the one real reminder of England. The familiar service echoes with memories of Christmas

[4] *I.e.* Great, or festal, day.

[5] Macaulay, *Essay on Warren Hastings*.

in country house or rectory or cottage, when the springs of earlier life were unclouded by the murky East. On Christmas morning, alone in the year, two Lessons are read; and the First Lesson suggests, perhaps appropriately to an armed assembly on the Festival of Peace, the paradox of Christian patriotism: 'For all the armour of the armed man in the tumult, and the garments rolled in blood, shall even be for burning, for fuel of fire. For unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given; and the Government shall be upon His shoulder: and His Name shall be called Wonderful Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace. Of the increase of His government of peace there shall be no end . . .'

The cynic sees no religion is this custom. He ascribes it to the conservatism of the social system, and inclines us to take him on his own ground and to say: 'So much the better for the society which conserves the custom; so much the worse for one which could cynically slough it off.' For, whatever be its inadequacy or its failure, it is a product of the National Religion; a wayside shrine on the road to the City of God, of which it is written that 'The Nations of them which are saved shall walk in the Light of it; and the Kings of the Earth do bring their glory and honour into it.'

REVIEWS

A CORNER-STONE OF THEOLOGICAL RECONSTRUCTION

Dr. Rashdall's volume of Bampton Lectures[1] is probably the most important theological work which has appeared for several years. Its value consists not only in the massive learning and philosophic temper which are displayed, but perhaps even more in the clear-sighted courage which faces one of the main religious problems of our age, tests the various solutions which have been offered, and shows the inadequacy of those which are most loudly advocated. Theologians will read this book with delighted interest. But for the general reader a work so solid in substance and so closely woven in texture seems to require some introduction. I propose, therefore, not so much to write an appreciation as to give a brief account of the treasures which the careful reader will be able to appropriate. In doing so I shall have to touch lightly upon the main points, and to omit many interesting matters altogether.

[1] *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*, by Hastings Rashdall, D.Litt., D.C.L., LL.D., F.B.A. Macmillans (1919). 15/- net.

Standing upon the bridge at Lyons the traveller may see the waters of the clear Saône and the turbid Rhône flowing side by side in the same channel, yet remaining quite distinct. For many miles, we are told, they refuse to mingle; and it is only when the Rhône has deposited its glacier mud that the twin rivers become one.

Dr. Rashdall's book enables us to observe a similar phenomenon in the theological world. Ever since the eighth century before Christ, sinful man's cry for Atonement has received two rival answers, one transactional, the other ethical. Varying in form, and growing more complex with the advance of society, the two solutions of the problem have remained in essence unchanged. The one involves always something objective, some sacrifice or suffering required to satisfy the divine justice. The other is subjective or ethical, and depends upon a change of heart in the sinner who would be reconciled. The two solutions, in their simplest form, are contrasted in the familiar words of the prophet Micah.

'Wherewith shall I come before the Lord,
And bow myself before the high God?
Shall I come before him with burnt offerings,
With calves of a year old?
He hath shown thee, O man, what is good:
And what doth the Lord require of thee,
But to do justly, and to love mercy,
And to walk humbly with thy God?'

A world which for near a thousand years had been divided between the priestly and the prophetic conceptions of Atonement was suddenly called upon to translate into its own language the greatest fact in the experience of the human race. Challenged to say why it was that the life and death of Jesus Christ have wrought such a wondrous change in men's lives now and their hopes hereafter, men gave answers which were largely determined by their previous habits of thought. That is why, almost from the first, we find the Atonement of Jesus Christ described by some as transactional, by others as ethical.

Dr. Rashdall deserves our thanks for keeping this contrast always before the eyes of his readers, attentive to the various phases through which it passes. We cannot but regret that the limits of space forbade him to cover the whole course. He touches but slightly upon those Hebrew conceptions of Atonement which had so vast an influence; and his story ends abruptly with the Reformation. Yet it could hardly be otherwise. As he himself says, any adequate treatment of the four centuries since the Reformation would fill another large volume. And after all, while those centuries have produced many new varieties in detail, ingenious compromises and strange complications, they have not seen any addition to the vital elements of thought. Faith, obedience, penitence, sacrifice, satisfaction, substitution, are current conceptions inherited from the past. In so far as our treatment of them is altered, it is because we have attained to a truer conception of Divine Justice. The modern conscience has revolted against the cruder forms of the doctrines which were taught in the sixteenth century, and the champions of old tradition have been much occupied in softening the appearance of their theories without altering the essence.

Dr. Rashdall's historical method shows the rivalry and interplay of the different conceptions in each great period of Church history. Instructive and convincing as his treatment is, it requires very close attention. For my present purpose it seems more useful to follow each line of thought separately: first the two main transactional conceptions—sacrifice and

satisfaction; then the ethical; and lastly that of justification by faith, which occupies a middle position between the first two and the third.

But first of all it must be said that, as Dr. Rashdall's first chapter shows, our Lord's own recorded words give no ground for regarding His death as a sacrifice for sin. Only on one occasion did He connect it at all with sacrifice. And when He spoke of the cup as His blood of the new covenant He was referring to the covenant sacrifice, which was sacramental not piacular—the seal of a covenant, but not in any way an expiation for sin. In like manner it is shown that when He appropriated some of the prophet's language about the Suffering Servant, He did not include that part which implies a theory of 'satisfaction' or 'substitution'—'the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.' Dr. Rashdall concludes:

> 'that our Lord never taught that His death was necessary for the forgiveness of sins, or that any condition was required for forgiveness but the supreme one of repentance and that amendment which is implied in all sincere repentance.'

Theories of sacrifice and satisfaction, therefore, begin with St. Paul.

(*a*) The Jews of the first century thought in terms of sacrifice. It was inevitable that those who became Christians should translate the great new experience of conversion into the language they knew best. So the death of Christ, synchronising with the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb, and corresponding in its felt influence with the day of Atonement, could hardly fail to be described as a sacrifice. What is remarkable is the rarity of sacrificial language in the New Testament. In St. Paul's epistles it occurs a dozen times, in the first epistle of Peter once, in the first epistle of John four or five times, in the Synoptic Gospels (where the writers speak for themselves) not at all. Only in the epistle to the Hebrews does the conception of sacrifice occupy any considerable space: and there the language is vague, defining neither the nature nor the operation of the offering. But I venture to think that Dr. Rashdall underestimated the importance of sacrifice in that epistle. In St. John's Gospel, he truly says,

> 'so far as any actual explanation or formulated doctrine is concerned, there is not a word which necessarily implies a substitutionary sacrifice, or indeed any literal sacrifice at all' (p. 179).

We have to pass on half a century before we meet any serious reference to the crucifixion as a sacrifice. And even then Justin Martyr's language is only a faint echo of St. Paul's.

> 'He never speaks of Christ's death as being a punishment for sin, very rarely as a sacrifice. And when he explains, his explanations are all rational and ethical.'

That is, Justin Martyr regards the Lord's death as having effect through its influence on the character and conduct of men.

Some twenty years later, Origen's writings show that some of St. Paul's phrases about sacrifice and propitiation had become part of the conventional language of religion. But even in commenting on the epistle to the Romans Origen repudiates the transactional view of the crucifixion.

> 'For him the effect of Christ's death—whether mysterious or intelligible—is always to make men really better, not to satisfy either a divine command or a supposed metaphysical necessity for retribution or retrospective cancelling of the past.'

Athanasius (297—373) is the first of the Fathers who fully adopts the sacrificial side of St. Paul's teaching, and approaches the mediæval conception of Christ's death as a vicarious sacrifice.

> 'In this passage,' says Dr. Rashdall, 'Athanasius goes very near to the characteristic Western view that the Word became incarnate chiefly that he might be able to die; and approximates to the later view of "satisfaction" afterwards developed by Anselm.'

The conception of Athanasius was accepted and exaggerated by John of Damascus and Cyprian. But it was St. Thomas Aquinas (13th century) who crystallized the doctrine of sacrifice in the form which is best known to us.

> 'The death of Christ is treated in the most uncompromising and the crudest way as a sacrifice by which God was *placated*—that is St. Thomas' word. At the same time he wholly disclaims the idea that the love of God for man was caused for the first time by the death of Christ: its effect was simply to remove the obstacle to a continuance of that love which sin had created' (p. 375).

With St. Thomas we may stop: for he remains the standard for the Roman Church. And not only for the Roman Church. Bishop Gore writes: 'It frees the hand of God to give to man, in Him, all that He would give. That is why the atonement is called also propitiation. Not because it changes the disposition of God towards us, but because it enables Him freely to exhibit His mercy' (*The Religion of the Church*, p. 26).

(*b*) Anyone who reflects upon the great names which are absent from the above list, and upon the qualified assent which some who are included give to the doctrine of piacular sacrifice, will recognise how thin and intermittent is the stream of tradition which connects the modern Church with that part of St. Paul's teaching. Far more influential is another Pauline conception, which is often confused with it, though essentially distinct. The predominant power in shaping the early Christian conception of Atonement is derived from the 'Servant' passages in the book of Isaiah (xlii. 1-4, xlix. 1-6, l. 4-9, lii. 13—liii. 12). From St. Matthew to Ephesians there is not a single book of the New Testament which does not both quote and allude to these passages: while the first epistle of Peter and the epistle to the Hebrews draws upon them largely.

There is an obvious reason for this. The early Church, unanimously though mistakenly, understood the prophet to have meant by the Servant an individual martyr, not the personified Israel. Now whereas Jewish orthodoxy regarded sacrifice as atoning only for ceremonial or unintentional offences, it put no such limits upon the atoning power of a martyr's death. When, therefore, Jesus was identified with the Servant, the words, 'The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all,' could be applied in a full piacular sense. So St. Paul felt justified in writing 'Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf' (2 Cor. v. 21). He was followed by the authors of 1 Peter and Hebrews. But the Evangelists, while they colour their narratives of the Passion with reminiscences of the Servant, limit the parallel to the pathetic aspect, and always stop short of the piacular. In so doing they followed the example of our Lord (so far as the record goes), who applied the words 'He was reckoned with the transgressor' to Himself, but made no suggestion that His sufferings would serve for expiation.

It is apparently St. Paul who originated the doctrine of substitution or satisfaction which has a long and disastrous history.

> 'There are, indeed, only a few passages which necessarily suggest the idea of substituted punishment or substituted sacrifice. But there they are, and St. Paul's argument is unintelligible without them' (p. 94).

It was long before this conception of his was adopted by leading teachers of the Church.

> 'The first of the Fathers who holds the theory of an objective redemption approximating to the idea of substitution is Irenaeus, though even in him the theory is still always struggling with the older and more philosophical modes of presentation' (p. 233).

But from that time onward the theory steadily gains wider influence and cruder definiteness. Space does not allow me to quote Dr. Rashdall's summaries of the doctrine taught by Tertullian, Athanasius, Eusebius of Cæsarea, Chrysostom, and Cyril. But a word must be said of Ambrose, who initiated a new stage. 'The idea of substitutionary punishment has never yet found a more definite expression than in his doctrine that Christ died in order that, "since the divine decrees cannot be broken, the person rather than the sentence should be changed."'

St. Augustine followed his master.

> 'On the whole, in St. Augustine the idea of substituted or vicarious punishment is the central one. It stands out in his pages naked and unabashed. And St. Augustine's doctrine on this subject, and no other, was accounted orthodox doctrine in the Western Church until the advent of mediæval Scholasticism' (p. 334).

St. Thomas Aquinas and Anselm spoke rather of 'satisfaction' than of punishment. But he 'treats this idea of satisfaction as equivalent to the idea of punishment.' 'It is a convenient mode of satisfying for another,' says St. Thomas, 'when anyone subjects himself to the punishment which another merited' (p. 375).

However much the Reformers differed from the Roman Church on other subjects, they agreed with it in this belief.

> 'Whatever the ground of its necessity, there can be no doubt about the substitutionary character of the sacrifice made by Christ either in Luther or in Calvin. Indeed, the idea of substitution—the idea that the Son was treated by the Father exactly as if He were guilty humanity—is now pushed further than it had ever been pushed before' (p. 399).

The doctrine which was carried to such excess by Luther is criticised in ten admirable pages (420—430) which I would like to quote. But I must content myself with a few lines from the last paragraph.

> '[The traditional doctrine] is absolutely inconsistent with the teaching of the Founder of Christianity Himself. His teaching, as we have seen, was that no condition is required for forgiveness but sincere repentance or change of heart' (p. 429).

(*c*) That last sentence leads us naturally to consider what Dr. Rashdall has to say about that ethical view of Atonement which has always found advocates in the Christian Church.

Our Lord, who avowed that He stood in the line of the prophets spoke of the forgiveness of sins in language not dissimilar to theirs. They had required two conditions—repentance in the full sense which involves reformation, and the fear of God or the knowledge of God, which was the Hebrew equivalent of Faith—(faith in the sense of trust and love, not mere belief). What they expressed partially and haltingly is translated into divine music in the parable of the Prodigal Son.

Plainly, whatever was the effect wrought by the Lord's death, it must harmonize with His own teaching about the essentials of Atonement. It may supplement, but it cannot alter, the truth which He consistently pro-

claimed. Obvious as this appears, Dr. Rashdall does well to emphasise it: for many builders of theories of Atonement seem to have forgotten it entirely. None of them went quite so far as Luther, who 'carries the idea of substitution to such a point that he represents Christ as not merely dying instead of us, but as keeping the law instead of us' (p. 406). Others, however, have gone so far that it is necessary to show that in every generation there have been champions of an ethical conception of Atonement; who held that the death of Christ saves men, not by way of sacrifice or substitution, but by making men better.

St. Paul himself—that myriad-minded man—taught this truth with impressive eloquence. Few passages in Dr. Rashdall's book are so striking as that in which he contrasts Paul the Rabbinic theologian, deducing theories of justification from the Old Testament, and Paul who had the mind of Christ, whose 'deepest moral and religious convictions rest upon the deliverances of his own conscience, upon what he had learned from Christ, upon his own religious insight, and upon his personal experience of the effects which flowed from the acceptance of Christ' (pp. 118—124). That is the Paul who wrote the great chapter in praise of 'charity,' and told how 'God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself' (2 Cor. v. 19).

Many later teachers show the same dual consciousness. They follow Paul the Rabbi in theories of substitution; but they also follow Paul the prophet in declaring that penitence and faith are the essentials. So the ethical view of atonement has never been without witnesses. But here there is space to mention only two or three who stand out from the rest. Of Origen Dr. Rashdall writes:

> 'Whenever the traditional language is explained, it is explained in the pre-Irenæan manner. The death of Christ completes the revelation begun by the life and the teaching. It fulfils the prophecies: it constitutes the supreme proof of perfect obedience, the supreme revelation of love, both of the Word and of the Father whom He reveals: it is the supreme example of self-sacrifice and humility. If he does sometimes ascribe to the death of Christ all the spiritual effects which follow from the incarnation taken as a whole, it is because the part is taken as a symbol of the whole; and it is by a moral influence upon the believer that the work of Christ is held to justify and save' (p. 258).

Abelard was condemned to perpetual imprisonment for writing passages such as this:

> 'Our redemption is that supreme love of Christ shown to us by His passion, which not only frees us from slavery to sin, but acquires for us the true liberty of the sons of God, so that we fulfil all things not so much from fear as from love of Him who exhibited so great favour towards us' (p. 358).

And his disciple Peter the Lombard says:

> 'So great a pledge of love having been given us, we too are moved and kindled to love God who did such great things for us: and by this we are justified, that is, being loosened from our sins we are made just. The death of Christ, therefore, justifies us, inasmuch as through it charity is excited in our hearts.'

This ethical view, almost universal in the Church till the days of Irenæus, and maintained in all ages by some of the greatest teachers, is that which Dr. Rashdall himself professes to hold.

> 'The eternal meaning of the Christian doctrine of salvation through Christ alone is that in the acceptance of this supreme revelation lies the true way of being saved from sin and attaining the fullest deliverance from sin, and the highest perfection of which human nature is capable. . . . So understood, the self-sacrificing life which was consummated by the death upon the Cross has indeed power to take away the sins of the whole world.'

Critics might say of this, as they have said of similar statements, that it does not show how the cross assures the penitent of divine forgiveness and favour. In reply to such I would quote the words of an American theologian:

> 'An examination of such criticisms will show that those who make them are holding the picture of a transcendent God, to whom the cross was external, and from whom, therefore, must come a message not contained in the moral influence of the cross itself. If, however, God is [not only transcendent but also] immanent, he is in the cross. The appeal which it makes is his appeal. And no one can hope to attain peace with God who makes the cross external to himself. Paul, who made so much of the significance of the death of Christ, also insisted that atonement meant the identification of the sinner in spirit with the Christ who died upon the Cross. Salvation comes, not because of a transaction between God and man, but because man may share the very life of God if he identifies himself in this way with the cross.' [Gerald Binney Smith—Chicago.]

(*d*) When St. Paul wrote of being 'justified by faith' he was perhaps consciously trying to reconcile the ethical with the transactional conception of Atonement. The words may mean that an intellectual belief in the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice assures the sinner of pardon: and Dr. Rashdall takes this to be the primary meaning in St. Paul's mind. But the phrase is capable of four meanings: for each of its terms is ambiguous. Justification may be either *mere acquittal* or an actual making righteous: and faith may mean either *mere belief* or an 'unreserved, self-forgetting, surrender of the whole man to the Saviour' (p. 110). St. Paul certainly uses faith in both those senses, and we cannot always be sure which he intends. And though justification for him usually means acquittal, it probably sometimes means a change of character. Obviously the phrase justification by faith is or is not a link between the two conceptions of Atonement according to the sense in which the two nouns are used. The Catholic epistles and the early Fathers ignore the sense of belief, and almost identify faith with character, or even with obedience (p. 226). In other words, their conception of the Atonement was purely ethical.

St. Augustine, who insisted much upon the Pauline formula, gave a single sense to each of its terms. For him it is *intellectual belief* that produces *actual righteousness* and therefore salvation. But since, with a happy inconsistency, he followed St. Paul in demanding love and good works, his formula really did unite the two elements, personal goodness and the substitutional transaction, as conditions of salvation. Luther, who was in many things his disciple, did not accept his use of justification, but took it in the strictly legal sense of *acquittal*. He could write:

> 'A little point of doctrine is of more value than heaven and earth: therefore we do not suffer it to be injured in the smallest particular. But at errors of life we may very well connive.'

And again:

> 'This is the Gospel . . . that the law has been fulfilled by Christ

so that it is not necessary to fulfil it, but only to adhere and be conformed to Him who fulfils it.'

In other words, faith is only a part of a transaction, and does not link it to personal religion. Happily Luther was not consistent. In his wiser moments he taught a doctrine which differed little from that of the Schoolmen whom he denounced.

> 'That the only faith which saves is "formed faith" (*fides formata*), a faith which produces love, from which good works must result' (p. 390).

Yet upon millions of his followers the effect of his formal doctrine has been disastrous. On the whole, therefore, the doctrine of justification by faith has failed to unite the two conceptions of Atonement. Except by a very few writers it has been identified either with the ethical or with the transactional conception. But I must write no more on a subject which demands a whole essay for itself.

An article of mine, which appeared in the *Journal of Theological Studies* in January, 1919, ended with these words:

> 'The above considerations, taken all together, may help to explain why the Christian Church has hitherto failed to reach a definitive conception of the Atonement. Theologians have assumed that there must be in the pages of the New Testament one authoritative view, which has only to be made plain in order to be accepted. If, on the other hand, the New Testament writers present us with three inconsistent views derived from the Hebrew Scriptures, besides the mystical views of St. Paul and St. John, the study of their writings is only a stage in the process by which the Church may hope to frame a final formula. The next stage must consist in sifting the spiritual experience of nineteen Christian centuries. And still there may be another stage beyond.'

A large part of that sifting has now been accomplished. Dr. Rashdall's book covers fifteen Christian centuries. May we not hope that he will devote another volume to the four centuries that remain? Meanwhile I earnestly commend his Bampton Lectures to all who desire to understand the problems connected with the doctrine of Atonement: for there, as never before, they are presented in the light of Christian experience. For that reason his book is destined to be a corner-stone in the coming theological reconstruction.

M. G. GLAZEBROOK.

RELIGION WITHOUT GOD*

This book is so uncompromisingly hostile to religion as to make its title a misnomer. The author doubted whether 'it is justifiable to retain the term religion when its ancient setting has been so completely discarded'; but decides in its favour because it signifies devotion and loyalty. 'The socialist is said to make a religion of his socialism, the social reformer of his work of constructive philanthropy, the artist of his art. We mean that he has thrown himself wholeheartedly into some one of these fields' (p. 221). We would remind the author that whether devotion constitutes religion depends upon the object towards which it is directed. When we say: 'The socialist makes a religion of his socialism,

* *The Next Step in Religion*, by Roy Wood Sellars, Ph.D. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price 8*s*.

&c.,' the metaphorical use of the word is clear and no one is likely to be deceived; but it is otherwise with the title of this book. We wish the author had exercised a little more of that courage upon which, in the first chapter, he promises to act, and by dropping the word religion had avoided the very appearance of sailing under false colours.

There can be no mistake about the author's attitude to Christianity; it is simply a tissue of irrelevancies. Mankind is outgrowing theism in a gentle and steady way. 'Paul's God was an oriental monarch; to the modern, he is a cad.' p. 182. Providence is merely the action of an agent who is more than human; but as there is no such agent, providence is a delusion. 'Such attitudes and expectations as prayer, ritual, worship, immortality, providence, are expressions of the prescientific view of the world' (p. 6). Our author is not quite sure that Jesus ever lived, 'but it seems more plausible to give a relative credence to the older strands of tradition in the New Testament.' Thus, that Jesus lived seems more than probable. As for man, 'I am inclined to prophesy that psychology and physiology will reach an adjustment of their principles before many years have passed, and that consciousness and mind will take their places along with mass and energy in the scientific view of nature' (p. 149). 'The human personality is a function of this sublunar life, of this organism, of this sky, of this soil, of this restless struggle with nature. Immortality is an impossible surgery' (p. 150). 'Religious romanticism is a spiritual narcotic which substitutes a dream world for the more humdrum world of every-day existence' (p. 151). The arguments by which the author supports these positions are of the usual kind; sceptics have repeated them *ad nauseam*. Science proves miracles to be impossible; criticism has shown the Bible to be a self-contradictory book; the views of Jesus were those of his own age; whilst belief in the soul is a relic of an imperfect psychology. If this book is the best that scepticism can do, then it is played out. When the author tells us that 'the majority of critics regard Mark as the oldest (Gospel) but this is mere guess work when all is said and done'; we know what value to place upon him as a New Testament scholar. His setting forth the assumption, that psychology has entirely dissipated the soul, as though it were a settled fact is, to say the least, a misrepresentation of the position.

Let us examine one example of our author's historical criticism. In a chapter on 'The Origins of Christianity' he deals with St. Paul. Paul was born and educated in the Greek city of Tarsus. Stoicism flourished there, and there is the strongest evidence in Paul's epistles that he was well acquainted with the doctrines of Stoicism. That is not all, 'when Paul speaks of mysteries, he is referring to the various cults which permeated the Roman world.' The most developed and ethical of these cults was called Mithraism. 'Now Tarsus was one of the chief seats of Mithraism, and it is practically certain that Paul was acquainted with its main rituals and beliefs.' 'When we bear in mind how little importance Paul attached to the actual life and ethical teaching of Jesus, we are not surprised at the frequent suggestion that Paul was the real founder of both liturgical and theological Christianity.' 'We can comprehend the work of Paul only when we see him as the mystical interpreter weaving the Jewish traditions of the soberer type, the apocalyptic outlook of such books as Daniel and Ezra, the mystery cults of the Hellenistic world and the theories of the Stoic philosophy into one whole, dominantly supernatural' (p. 166-70).

Now does this account for Paul? We do not hesitate to assert that you

may put Stoicism, Mithraism, and Jewish traditions into your hat, but no trick of legerdemain will enable you to draw out Paulinism. What are we to say of an attempt to account for Paul which is silent about the power that changed the persecuting Pharisee into the Christian Apostle, that dissolved his apocalyptic pessimism in a sense of triumphant joy, and that inspired him with a passionate zeal in the loving service of mankind which has been the wonder of eighteen centuries? Other Jews in the Roman Empire knew Stoicism and Mithraism, but did not become missionaries. Why does our author maintain a similar silence about the lofty ethics of St. Paul? We do not care to suggest that the cause of his silence is ignorance; but, if not, what is it?

We will now return to a more philosophical chapter, *viz.*: 'The Problem of Evil.' The author's attack on Theism need not detain us; it is simply the old story that has done duty for 2,000 years. 'Christianity is on the horns of a terrible dilemma. God must be totally responsible for all physical evils, at least; or else he must be thwarted by something independent of himself, whether this be an evil spirit or matter' (p. 159). We are more interested in the author's own solution. Briefly, there is no problem. 'Physical evil is evil only because it hurts man, who does not want to be hurt. From the objective standpoint, evil and good differ not a jot one from another. They are both causal events baptised by man in accordance with his sympathies and antipathies. Events are good to him or bad to him; in themselves they are neither good nor bad' (p. 166). We wish to say bluntly, especially as our author takes a pride in plain speaking, that the objective standpoint from which good and evil do not differ has no existence outside the author's imagination. *'Events in themselves'* are evidence of a false theory of knowledge. Knowledge of such events is an impossibility. It is true that the problem of good and evil is created by events being related to man's sympathies and antipathies, but it is absurd to attempt to solve the problem by denying the relationship. Of events in themselves you can say nothing, not even that they exist.

On the same page we read that the problem of evil 'is a problem of engineering, of applied chemistry, of preventive medicine, of social planning'; and fourteen lines further on: 'But science, alone, will never be sufficient to meet the fact of evil.' Here the author comes up against moral evil, but he has no solution, neither can he add anything to science except 'courage on the part of the actor' and 'sympathy on the part of those near him.'

We wonder if our author will ever ask himself how it happens that Christian men can read books such as his without the slightest injury to their Christian faith. If so, let him not say they are the victims of delusions. Some of them know as much of Biblical Criticism, others know as much of science, and others again know as much of philosophy, as he does. It is a problem he will do well to ponder. Is it not reasonable to suppose that they have found something which he has missed? To suggest that they have committed intellectual suicide, or that they are too anxious about the next world to care for humanity in this, would be to pervert the facts. The truth is the soul's relation to God is one of the great realities of life, and criticism and ridicule leave it unaffected.

There is one other point. This book advocates a religion within the limits of humanity, wherein man shall be true to human values and devote himself to truth, beauty and goodness, without the background of celestial omnipotences and perfections. In science, philosophy and art reason shall have fair play, and faith have nothing to fear because it will have no

tottering creed to sustain. We have no desire to criticise this, but we make a suggestion. Our author believes in the experimental method; will he screw up his courage and put his religion to the test, not in England or America, because in these countries the influence of Christianity is so wide-spread that it would vitiate the test, but among some uncivilised savage tribe. Christianity has often raised men from the lowest depths of barbarism, can humanism do it? We doubt it. We question whether it has sufficient vitality to inspire its adherents to make the trial. If it is so much better than Christianity as the author presents it to be, it ought to do wonderful things; why should not the author become its first missionary?

J. T. Newton.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE HONOUR SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT OXFORD AS A PREPARATION FOR HOLY ORDERS.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

Sir,

You will not, I hope, regard it as presumptuous of me to state my own impressions of the religious and spiritual needs of the average layman, and of the relation between those needs and the equipment which an undergraduate in the Honour School of Theology at Oxford now receives for dealing with them.

How far does the Oxford Honour School of Theology, which represents so fully the results of modern historical and theological scholarship, really afford its students an adequate equipment for meeting the difficulties of the modern situation? Certainly it unravels for them some of the mysteries of the composite structure of the Pentateuch; it shows them what parts of the book that bears his name the prophet Isaiah probably wrote, and the much more that he almost certainly did not write; it leads the students through the labyrinth of the Synoptic problem, and it introduces them to the babel of heresies that vexed the minds of the pious down to so late a date as the latter part of the fifth century A.D. Thus armed, with a positive answer to the intellectual difficulties of the first four or five centuries, and a largely negative answer to the biblical difficulties of the twentieth century, the young clergyman emerges upon a congregation of people who are almost entirely ignorant of the fact that J, E, D and P lie hidden beneath the surface of the Books of Moses; and that Q is incorporated in the first and third gospels; who are not only ignorant of the heresies of the first five centuries, but would be extremely bored if anyone endeavoured to expound to them the errors of Marcion and of the Anomœans.

And yet, at the same time, of the people in the congregation who look up to the young curate for light,—working-men, shopkeepers, and professional men,—in fact, nearly all,—(except those who took 'Greats' at Oxford, and alas, even some of those),—have, in the back of their minds, some very grave and fundamental problems for which they can find no solution, the very existence of which makes them take their religion with a pinch of salt. Though the young curate were a modern of the moderns, and could search out the inmost recesses of J, E, P and D; though he could assert with the utmost fervour of conviction that the 'Great Unknown' who

wrote the 53rd chapter of Isaiah did not and could not have been thinking of Jesus Christ; though he could convince his congregation that nearly all the writers of the Old Testament held absolutely nothing like the Christian faith in immortality, but regarded the future life rather more from the standpoint of the modern spiritualist, except when they held strongly the opinion of the modern materialist; though he could persuade his hearers that, in view of both the higher and lower criticism of the Gospels, the popular phrase, 'Gospel Truth,' has become singularly ambiguous; though he could go forward to a consideration of the creeds, explaining their origin and historical development, and the vital importance of each of the clauses at the time of its introduction, and, to the modern mind, the comparative unimportance of several of those clauses to-day,—though our modern young clergyman could set forth all these results of his two or three years of patient labour, yet he would be shooting his arrows against the moon so far as concerned the problems in the back of the minds of his congregation.

The majority of these people, and perhaps the working men especially, although they may never have read a book on the subject themselves, are vaguely aware of the materialistic views of the universe which prevailed a generation ago. They believe that those are the latest and the most competent views of the universe, and of the origin and nature of man. They have heard the echo of Darwin, and Huxley and Spencer, and while many of them may have only the crudest idea of what these scientists stood for, they imagine that their philosophy is generally accepted in scientific circles to-day, and, further, that the acceptance of their scientific discoveries explains away the divine origin of man, the existence of the soul, and the reality of a spiritual world; indeed, that while there may or may not have been a celestial architect of the firmament, yet at any rate that architect—or that bundle of natural laws—cannot be shewn to bear the faintest resemblance to the Christian God, takes not the slightest interest in a pigmy race inhabiting an insignificant planet like this, and either does not hear, or cannot alter things, when we pray to Him. This view they find endorsed at the present day by popular and fairly well informed writers like Mr. J. M. Robertson, Mr. Blatchford, and Mr. Bernard Shaw. If they continue to attend church services on Sunday, it is not with any expectation of having these fundamental doubts removed. They are likely enough to hear that faith is a virtue, and they are more or less inclined to believe that perhaps it is a virtue, and to exercise it as far as they can, in spite of those weighty difficulties to which there seems to be no answer beyond the exhortation to have faith as a little child.

A draper's assistant said to me not long ago, 'We are hungering for ideas, but we don't get them in church.' A man of wealth and position meant much the same thing when he wrote to me the other day, 'As one grows older, one feels more and more the need of religion, and yet it seems so difficult to get hold of anything.' What help can our young clergy give them? Hardly a drop of the midnight oil which the young theological student has been burning in his critical study of the Holy Scriptures, in his Dogmatic and Symbolic Theology, and in the History of the Christian Church down to 461 A.D., would illuminate a single one of the shadows that lurk at the back of the lay mind. In fact, the young clergyman is often quite as painfully aware of the insistence of these problems, as are the more sceptical members of his congregation. And, the worst of it is, he can take his first in Classical Mods., his first in the Honour School of Theology; he can go forth to his labours endorsed as a brilliant and

strictly up-to-date scholar of the University of Oxford, and yet remain as hopelessly unqualified to deal with the problems that are troubling the thoughtfully inclined members of his congregation, as if he had taken a degree in mathematics with a view to becoming a teacher of chemistry.

This holds true, without overlooking the lectures of the Regius Professor of Divinity, for they are not of necessity required for the usual group of subjects,—(Holy Scriptures, Dogmatic and Symbolic Theology, and Ecclesiastical History),—or such courses as those of Dr. McDougall, Mr. Collingwood, Mr. C. C. J. Webb, and others. These lectures are excellent, but they seldom receive the consideration and careful study that they deserve, because they do not bear directly upon the final examination unless a man has elected to take the Philosophy of Religion as one of his subjects,—a subject selected by comparatively few, and one which men are often advised not to attempt, unless they have already done the philosophy part of *Literæ Humaniores*.

The point is, that the subjects that are deepest and most fundamental are neglected, because of the enormous amount of time which has to be given to subjects which are chiefly critical and archæological, and therefore remote from the interests of the men who are living and doubting and toiling and dying in the parishes where most of us will be called to minister. A Cambridge don startled me at first by saying that he considered it a misfortune that the missionaries went out to heathen countries 'encumbered with the whole of the Old Testament,' but I have since come to feel that it is a misfortune that the average Honours man in Theology goes forth to his labours encumbered with the elaborate critical and largely negative results of modern academic theology, while he is, on the other hand, handicapped by a lack of equipment for dealing impressively with the haunting questions of 'The whence, the why, and the whither of human destiny.' To put it in military language, he is armed, as it were, with a howitzer for destroying that small and retreating band of obscurantists who still look into the Bible with a joyful confidence that it is the verbally inspired word of God, while he hardly has more than a water-pistol for overcoming the disbelief of those heavy battalions who are unprepared to admit the influence and guidance of any Holy Spirit at all.

One cannot but look upon the great number of young men who are now receiving the modern and critical teaching of the Oxford School of Theology and wonder how far their training will contribute to the positive elements of their future teaching. Give them the advantage of supposing that they are the children of light, well acquainted with the results of modern critical scholarship: suppose they abandon belief in the Virgin Birth; suppose they abandon belief in the physical resurrection of Christ; suppose they abandon belief in the power of God and of His Son our Lord to work miracles by arresting the normal course of nature; suppose they abandon belief in what they probably thought was Christ's 'full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world,'—suppose they attain all these marks of enlightenment; yet what is there in the Oxford course to replace in positive content so much that brought joy and assurance to our fathers? What are the glad tidings that the Oxford Honour School in Theology is teaching them to proclaim in the place of these? How are they being fitted to bring greater, or as much, comfort to the sorrowful, power to overcome sin to the tempted, peace to the remorseful, or hope to the dying, as some old parish priest who never heard of Q, or the Docetists, or even of the blessed Deutero-Isaiah?

We are told that the modern mind cannot accept the old-fashioned

miraculous Christianity, and I must sorrowfully admit that it is almost as hard to believe in the now abandoned God who could work a physical miracle in answer to prayer, as it is to believe in the newly-adopted God who is not able to work a physical miracle, when by so doing He might relieve some intolerable suffering or right some monstrous wrong.

It is presumed that the young clergyman will work out these problems for himself in future years. But he is likely to have few opportunities for deep reading, and what reading he does will probably be haphazard, without guidance, and without very satisfactory results.

I can only say with all deference that the Honour School of Theology would supply better the need of which I am aware, if it consisted of a much briefer introduction to the modern critical view of sacred literature, and a much more thorough introduction to the 'humanities,' and to such modern thinkers as are restoring to us a spiritual view of the universe, together with the lives of the greater Christian saints and the psychology of religious experience. What for our purpose could be more profitable than a survey of the trend of recent thought, through a period of materialism to a new spiritual and idealistic view of life and destiny?

The future clergy would then be able,—partly in their sermons, but perhaps more profitably in classes and conversations,—to deal helpfully with those problems which are really at the back of people's minds to-day, and a great majority of the average laymen would learn with eager satisfaction that the materialistic views which they had believed to be the latest and most highly endorsed, are really somewhat out of date and proving inadequate in the opinion of those most competent to judge.

IN STATU PUPILLARI.

[No doubt to be ignorant but religious is a better preparation for the Christian Ministry than to be an intellectualist without religion. But neither is a good preparation. On one occasion an uneducated man said to Dr. South, 'Doctor, God has no need of your learning.' To which the Doctor replied, 'No, my good man, nor of your ignorance.' The Honour School of Theology only seeks to remove ignorance, not to teach Religion. Religion is cultivated in other ways. New knowledge will probably have a devastating effect on traditional views, but the religious faith of the Christian teacher which survives these intellectual trials will enable its possessor to accomplish in the modern world what he could not have accomplished without such a period of education and probation. In the long run, if the discipline be faithfully and bravely endured, it will be found to give much more than it takes away.

We agree, however, with our correspondent that as an intellectual preparation for Ordination the Honour School of Theology is properly open to criticism. While its philological and critico-historical side is strong, its philosophical side is weak. This is due entirely to its philosophical side not being compulsory.

We venture to suggest that the ideal course would be for the University to create a School of Theological Moderations which would confine itself to the study of Hellenistic Greek, patristic Latin, and Biblical Hebrew. All three being compulsory. Then the Final School of Theology could be greatly strengthened on the philosophical (*i.e.* metaphysical, ethical and psychological) side by making Philosophy compulsory.

We would add, to save misunderstanding, that the Oxford Ordination Course seeks to teach Religion as well as Theology, and that those responsible for it do encourage the study of philosophy and Christian apologetic.—Ed., *M.C.*]

MACMILLAN'S NEW AND FORTHCOMING BOOKS.

THE HOPE OF MAN: Sermons preached before the University of Oxford. By the Very Rev. W. H. HUTTON, B.D., Dean of Winchester. Crown 8vo.

THE SPIRIT: God and His Relation to Man considered from the standpoint of Philosophy, Psychology and Art. By A. SETH PRINGLE-PATTISON, LILY DOUGALL, J. ARTHUR HADFIELD, C. A. ANDERSON SCOTT, CYRIL W. EMMET, A. CLUTTON-BROCK, and B. H. STREETER (Editor). 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.* net. [*Ready*

The Christian World: 'The book is crammed with interest. May we see other such brave collective attempts to get at reality in the atmosphere of fellowship and prayer.'

THE IDEA of ATONEMENT in CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY. The Bampton Lectures for 1915. By HASTINGS RASHDALL, D.Litt., D.C.L., LL.D., Dean of Carlisle. 8vo. 15*s.* net. [*Ready*

The Challenge: 'The Dean of Carlisle has made many contributions to the serious Christian thought of our age; but none has been so important as this. He has given us a book weighty alike for learning and for judgment, inspired by deep personal devotion, and calculated to remove from many the obstacles which prevent them from seeking salvation from the crucified Messiah.'

PATHWAYS TO CHRISTIAN UNITY: A Free Church View. By ARTHUR BLACK, G. E. DARLASTON, W. E. ORCHARD, WILLIAM PATON, J. H. SQUIRE, MALCOLM SPENCER. Crown 8vo. 6*s.* net. [*Ready*

The Methodist Recorder: 'One of the most considerable yet produced on these high matters. . . . Indeed, if only one book can be owned and studied, this is the one. It not only illuminates old foundation truths, it breaks new ground for new foundations—a very timely and profitable production.'

CHRIST'S THOUGHT OF GOD. Ten Sermons Preached in Worcester Cathedral in 1919. By JAMES M. WILSON, D.D., Canon and Vice-Dean of Worcester. Crown 8vo.

THE TESTING OF A NATION. By RANDALL T. DAVIDSON, D.D., D.C.L., Archbishop of Canterbury. Crown 8vo. 6*s.* net. [*Ready*

THE MIND OF THE DISCIPLES. By NEVILLE S. TALBOT, M.C., Author of 'Thoughts on Religion at the Front.' *Second Edition.* Crown 8vo. 5*s.* net.

THE REALM OF PRAYER. By the Rev. R. H. COATS, M.A., B.D., Author of 'Types of English Piety,' 'The Christian Life,' &c. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

AN INTRODUCTION TO OLD TESTAMENT STUDY. For Teachers and Students. By the Rev. E. BASIL REDLICH, M.A. With Foreword by the Dean of Westminster. Crown 8vo. 6*s.* net.

The BISHOP OF WAKEFIELD writes:—'Mr. Redlich has produced a book for which all who are called upon to teach lessons from the Old Testament in pulpit or classroom should be profoundly grateful.'

'SIR HOBBARD DE HOY.' The Religious Education of the Adolescent. By the Rev. E. F. BRALEY, M.A., LL.M. [*Ready*

The Times: 'Those who desire to raise the educational standard of the country, as well as those who wish to promote the religious life of our lads and lasses, must make the care of Sir Hobbard de Hoy their chief concern.'

Macmillan's New Theological Catalogue post free on application.

MACMILLAN & CO., LTD., LONDON, W.C.2.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN'S LIBRARY.

Edited by the Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

3s. 6d. net each volume. In Paper Covers, 2s. net each.

I. The Faith of a Modern Churchman. By the Rev. Canon M. G. GLAZEBROOK, D.D., Canon of Ely. *Second Edition.*

'His simple statement of Christian doctrine is characterised by courage, wide learning, a broad point of view, and a very real reverence.'—*The Scotsman.*

II. The Genius of the English Church. By the Rev. ALFRED FAWKES, M.A., Vicar of Ashby St. Ledgers.

'We hope it may secure a very wide circle of readers.'—*The Spectator.*

III. The Evolution of the Christian Ministry. By the Rev. J. R. COHU, M.A. (sometime Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford).

'We do not know anyone who could have written it better.'—*Expository Times.*

IV. Baptism, Confirmation and the Eucharist. By the Rev. JOHN GAMBLE, B.D., Vicar of St. Mary's, Leigh Woods.

'His clear and reverent treatment of a difficult subject . . . will commend the book to Churchmen of all schools.'—*Nation.*

JOHN MURRAY, Albemarle Street, LONDON, W.1.

GEORGE ALLEN AND UNWIN, Limited.

THE MORE FATAL OPULENCE OF BISHOPS. 2s. 6d.
By Rev. Hubert Handley.

'Mr. Handley has a sharp pen and a warm heart . . . but no "Comfortable Churchman" can read the eloquent sermon called "The Sin" without distinct sensations of uneasiness.'—*Westminster Gazette.*

THE MAKING OF HUMANITY. By Robert S. Briffault. 12s. 6d.

'An astonishing book . . . a tour de force of rapid historical exposition . . . A masterly analysis of human progress. We hope Democracy will study this brave and brilliant book.'—*English Review.*

THE NEXT STEP: An Essay on the Missing Policeman. 4s. 6d.
By Alfred Ollivant.

'Mr. Ollivant has never done anything better than this noble attempt. . . . and for the clergy a storehouse of vital sermons.'—*Challenge.*

PAGAN AND CHRISTIAN CREEDS. By Edward Carpenter. 10s. 6d.

'. . . a genius which is both scientific and artistic, philosophic and poetic.'—*Observer.*

40 MUSEUM STREET, LONDON, W.C. 1.

The Sheldonian Shorthand and Typewriting Offices, 45 Broad Street, Oxford.

(Behind the Post Office. No front shop). Tel. 500.

CONDUCTED BY A PRACTISED WRITER:

Prize Essayist and Magazine Editor.

Prospectus on Application.